# Bengal MS. Records, 1782-1807

WITH A

*DISSERTATION ON LANDED PROPERTY AND*
*LAND-RIGHTS IN BENGAL*
*AT THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY*

# Bengal MS. Records

*A SELECTED LIST OF 14,136 LETTERS*

IN THE BOARD OF REVENUE, CALCUTTA, 1782–1807, WITH AN HISTORICAL DISSERTATION AND ANALYTICAL INDEX

BY SIR WILLIAM WILSON HUNTER

K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
M.A. OXFORD, LL.D. CAMBRIDGE

VOLUME I.

1782 TO 1793

W. H. ALLEN & CO. LD.
Publishers to the India Office
LONDON, 1894

TO

SIR ALFRED LYALL, K.C.B., D.C.L.

THESE MATERIALS FOR THE

STUDY OF RURAL BENGAL AND OF ITS LAND TENURES

AS EVOLVED BY BRITISH LEGISLATION

ARE INSCRIBED

MORRISON AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## VOLUME I.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| DISSERTATION ON LAND-RIGHTS IN BENGAL, . . . . . | 11-139 |
| CHAP. | |
| I. EXPERIMENTS IN ADMINISTRATION, FROM THE IMPERIAL GRANT OF 1765 TO THE ARRIVAL OF LORD CORNWALLIS IN 1786, . | 11-22 |
| II. THE LAND SYSTEM BEFORE 1793: THE STATE AND THE LANDHOLDERS, . . . . . . . . | 23-46 |
| III. LAND RIGHTS BEFORE 1793: THE LANDHOLDERS AND THE CULTIVATORS, . . . . . . . | 47-73 |
| IV. REASONS FOR DECLARING THE SETTLEMENT OF 1793 PERMANENT, | 74-84 |
| V. DISAPPOINTING RESULTS OF THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT AS REGARDS THE LANDHOLDERS, . . . . . | 85-114 |
| VI. FAILURE OF THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT TO PROTECT THE CULTIVATORS, . . . . . . . | 115-139 |

LETTERS FROM JANUARY 1782 TO DECEMBER 1793, . Nos. 1 to 3,299


## VOLUME II.


LETTERS FROM JANUARY 1794 TO DECEMBER 1797, Nos. 3,300 to 7,016


## VOLUME III.


LETTERS FROM JANUARY 1798 TO DECEMBER 1801, Nos. 7,017 to 10,478


## VOLUME IV.


LETTERS FROM JANUARY 1802 TO DECEMBER 1807, Nos. 10,479 to 14,136

INDEX TO VOLUMES I., II., III., AND IV., . . Pp. 337-388

# A DISSERTATION

ON

## LANDED PROPERTY AND LAND RIGHTS IN BENGAL AT THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

# INTRODUCTION.

## CHAPTER I.

### FROM THE IMPERIAL GRANT OF 1765 TO THE ARRIVAL OF CORNWALLIS IN 1786.

AT an early period in my service I was attracted by the manuscript records in the District Offices of Bengal. Between 1863 and 1866, Sir Cecil Beadon, then Lieutenant-Governor, gave me facilities for examining the older papers in the nine south-western Collectorates which constituted the Presidency and Bardwan Divisions. Similar opportunities were granted by the two succeeding Lieutenant-Governors, Sir William Grey and Sir George Campbell, for an examination of the District records in Orissa and other Divisions of the Lower Provinces. Some of the results were published in my *Annals of Rural Bengal* (1868), *Orissa* (2 vols, 1872), and in nine of the volumes of the *Statistical Account of Bengal* (1875–1877); and I had hoped to be able to compile, in addition to my official duties, a complete District History of the Lieutenant-Governorship of Bengal.

My appointment as Director-General of Statistics to the Government of India in 1871, and the necessity of annually visiting the three Presidencies, rendered it

examined bore the date of 1765, the year in which the Diwání, or grant for the government of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, was obtained by the East India Company from the Mughal Emperor. The next seventeen years were spent by the Company's servants in tentative efforts at administration, and the continuous series of the Board's records does not commence until 1782. From that date the Board of Revenue, although modified from time to time, has remained substantially on the same basis, and its manuscript records during the half-century from 1782 to 1832 form 21,509 folio volumes and bundles of manuscripts.[1] Out of this innumerable series of letters and proceedings, I selected, with the aid of the two gentlemen mentioned on last page, those which seemed most noteworthy, whether for my own inquiries, or from the light which they throw upon the state of the country or on our early system of District administration. In some cases I brought together the scattered portions of a correspondence, so as to place in juxtaposition the letters from the local officials and the Board's orders thereon.

I do not offer the result as a substitute for the manuscript indices, extending over hundreds of folios, in the Board's record rooms. A mere enumeration of the documents contained in the 21,509 folio volumes and bundles down to the year 1832, could not be compressed into less than 250,000 pages; allowing only twelve pages to each folio or bundle. My object has been to indicate to historical students, and to the District Officers of Bengal, certain new aspects of the East India Company's rural administration in the last century, the localised incidents of that administration, and the materials existing

[1] For this enumeration I am indebted to the late Mr. Henry Beadon, C.S.

impossible for me to carry out the local investigations in a single Province necessary for such a work. I accordingly transferred my inquiries to the manuscript records at the headquarters of the several Governments, and drew up summaries of the results as I went along, including a *Note on the Records of the Board of Revenue, North-Western Provinces*, and *A Catalogue of the Historical MSS. in the India Office Library.* The latter gave an account of the contents of 382 manuscript volumes transferred from the archives of the East India Company.

The Bengal records, however, still remained my favourite subject of study. With the help of assistants, I went through the earliest manuscripts preserved in the Board of Revenue, Calcutta, and noted down a list of 17,000 letters illustrative of the District administration from 1782 to 1812. The first 14,136 letters of this list, dealing with the quarter of a century from 1782 to 1807, are summarised in the four following volumes. I acknowledge my obligations to successive Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal, Sir George Campbell, Sir Richard Temple, Sir Rivers Thompson, Sir Steuart Bayley, and especially to Sir Charles Elliot, for aid or encouragement in the prosecution of the work. But I still more gratefully record the assistance of my friends, Mr. Charles Dollman, whose promising career was cut short by an early death, and Babu Trailokya-nath Muhharji, who has since won for himself distinction in the service of Government.

The archives of the Board of Revenue, Calcutta, contain copies of almost all important letters, received or issued by it, in supervising the District administration of Bengal. The earliest English document which I

disquisitions of a contentious character, unsuitable in a work like the present. Before long I hope to be able to submit such a history, and to face the questions to which it gives rise. This essay merely examines certain features of the rural organisation, and throws the light of the original records on the actual condition of the classes interested in the land.

At the commencement of the period dealt with (1782–1807), the military and political ascendency of the East India Company had been firmly established in Bengal. The Company was the undisputed central governing power, but it had not yet been able to construct an orderly or efficient administration for the Districts which had passed under its rule. In 1782, even the task of internal pacification was still incomplete.[1] Some Districts were regularly harried by raids of the hill-men; others were overrun by armed bodies of sturdy beggars, religious mendicants, and the broken-up remnants of the troops of the previous Native Powers.[2] The protection of the cultivators from wild beasts still formed a grave problem of rural administration. The collection of the land revenue led to yearly struggles between the local authorities and the territorial native magnates: struggles not always confined to chicanery, falsehood, and flight on the one side, nor to the utmost exercise of civil rigours on the other. The Collector's bailiffs still constituted an armed force, and they sometimes required the aid of the regular troops. Each landholder held his own civil court, and kept up a private defensive police. Before the

[1] See Letters, Nos. 4, 30, 34, 59, Vol. I., and others too numerous to specify, cited under DISTURBANCES, in Index, Vol. IV.

[2] For the employment of troops in the Districts, see Letters, Nos. 805, 811, 856, 864, 868, 908, 1151, 1157, 1564, 1613, 1924, 2799, etc., all in Vol. I.

for a more complete study of each territorial division. I hope that these four volumes may give to many a young officer an additional interest in his District, and lead him to inquire for himself into its past. It was gratifying also to learn that the Bengal Government, after consulting the Board of Revenue, decided that my work might be useful as a guide to the official records of the period.

In 1782, the Committee of Revenue definitely developed into the Board of Revenue. During the next quarter of a century five great tasks fell to its lot. It had to create a staff of District administrators out of a body of mercantile clerks and factors, most of whom still regarded the annual Investment as the important part of the Company's government of Bengal. It had to supervise the introduction of a new legislative system, and to lay the foundations of rural administration afresh, on the basis of British-made law. It had to commence the separation of the judicial from the executive functions of the local authorities: then a novel experiment in India, and one which involved the creation of what seemed to be a conflicting mechanism of revenue and police offices and law-courts. It had to collect the information required for fixing the land tax, not merely on previous estimates, but also on the supposed actual capabilities of each District. It had to introduce and to enforce a Permanent Settlement based on the data thus collected. It is evident that an attempt to adequately exhibit the work of the Board of Revenue during this fundamental period of rural administration would far exceed the limits imposed on an introductory monograph. It would amount to a critical history of the origin of the rural administration of Bengal, and would involve

collection of the revenue formed almost the sole idea of government among the Native Powers who erected themselves on the ruins of the Mughal Empire; that it was essentially the function of government which was made over to the East India Company in 1765 by the Imperial grant for Bengal; and that it was out of the revenue administration, thus conferred upon the Company, that its judicial courts, civil and criminal, and its police system, gradually developed.

A brief retrospect at the period from 1765 to 1782 will show this. On the 12th August 1765,[1] the Mughal Emperor assigned the Diwání or revenue administration of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, to 'The English Company' for an annual payment of 2,600,000 rupees. Next year Clive formally took his seat as Diwán at the Punyá, or state ceremonial of commencing the annual collection of the land tax, held at Motijíl, near Murshidábád. The centre of the government remained at Murshidábád, and the internal administration, alike of the revenue and of justice, was left in the hands of the old native officials, chiefly Muhammadans. This divorce of the responsible control vested in the Company, from the actual conduct of the administration by the old native officials in the Districts, proved disastrous alike to the rulers and to the people.

Accordingly, in 1769, British Supervisors were appointed to superintend the local collections of the revenue and the rural administration of justice. They were furnished with detailed instructions for obtaining information concerning their respective divisions of the country; but the knowledge necessary for the task and much of the practical executive still continued with

[1] 1172, Bengal era.

end of the period covered by these volumes (1807), the Permanent Settlement, with all its defects, had rendered the collection of the revenue a matter of routine. Courts, jails, and a district police, however inefficient compared with modern standards, had scattered the armed robber-camps and plundering bands, and broken up the old system of organised pillage into more isolated, although still widely spread, gang-robberies by *dakaits*. All these changes can be easily traced under the proper headings in the index at the end of Volume IV.

The Permanent Settlement of 1793 is justly regarded as a revenue measure. But the great group of contemporary enactments in which it lies imbedded, and which were all more or less directly connected with its introduction, have two other aspects. They were, in the first place, an attempt to select the fittest from among the preceding mixed growth of British Regulations and Native Land-customs, and to consolidate them, together with the Company's rules of revenue-business, into a Code. In the second place, they mark the commencement of conscious and continuous legislation by the British Government. The enactments issued from time to time before the Cornwallis codification in 1793 were important. But they were of the nature of occasional Regulations having the force of law, rather than of systematic legislation. The sporadic character of these earlier Regulations resulted in part from the shifting character of the District administration and central control down to 1782. Their consolidation into a Code was rendered possible by the permanent methods gradually introduced by the Board of Revenue from that year onward, alike into the District administration and into the central control. It must be borne in mind that the

indeed, were but slowly recovering from the great famine of 1769–70.

The comparative failure of this mixed agency in the Districts led to a reaction, and it was resolved to substitute a closer Provincial Control by European officers, with a more exclusively Native agency in the direct collections. In 1773–4, the European Collectors were recalled from the Districts, and native Amils or agents were substituted, under the superintendence of six Provincial Councils, composed of the Company's British servants, at Calcutta, Bardwán, Dacca, Murshidábád, Dinájpur, and Patna.[1] On the expiry of the five years' settlement in 1777, annual settlements were made year by year with farmers until 1781, with a preference to the old zamíndárs even although not the highest bidders. But the Provincial Councils were gradually found to be too weak in numbers, and too widely scattered over the country, to be capable of exercising an effective superintendence. Again the pendulum swung back to the system of a direct British agency in the collections, under a strong British central control.

Accordingly, in 1781, the Provincial Councils were superseded, and a Committee of Revenue (which shortly changed its name to the Board of Revenue) was reconstituted in Calcutta. It consisted of five experienced European servants of the Company, and worked under the immediate inspection of the Governor-General in Council. The President of several of the Provincial Councils continued to act for a time as a sort of Commissioner of a Division under its orders, and the direct management of the District revenues was definitely entrusted to British Collectors. It should be remarked, however, that al-

[1] Tipperah and Chittagong remained under their own chiefs.

the native officials. The British Supervisors acted under the control of two Provincial Councils, at Murshidábád and Patna. In 1772, the Court of Directors, alarmed for their dividends, resolved on a fundamental reform. They determined 'to stand forth as Diwán, and to take on themselves the entire care and management of the revenues through the agency of their own servants.' Warren Hastings was nominated Governor-General, with orders to inaugurate the new policy; and as President of a Committee of Revenue, consisting of four Members of Council, he proceeded through the Provinces to conduct a fresh settlement. The Khalsa or chief revenue office was removed from Murshidábád to Calcutta, and the Supervisors of 1769 began to be known by the present title of Collectors.

The effect of this change in 1772 was to bring a British Central Control and a joint British and Native agency in the Districts into direct contact with the people. Every British Collector had still a native officer, chosen by the Committee of Revenue and styled Diwán joined with him in the superintendence of the land tax. The actual collection was managed by the farming system, according to which tenders were invited for each Pargana, or fiscal division of a District. A settlement for five years (1772–1777) was concluded with the highest bidders, whether they were the previous zamíndárs or not. When zamíndárs were thus ousted, a subsistence allowance was granted to them out of the revenue. This first attempt at a more direct management of the Districts by English agency, produced only a partial improvement. Many of the tenders had been accepted from speculative revenue farmers, and proved to be beyond the amount that could be extracted from the cultivators. The latter,

permanent rules by which their respective tributes, rents, and services shall be in future rendered and paid.'[1] At the end of the following year, 1785, the Court of Directors determined to reorganise the Government at Calcutta, and struck the first note of the Permanent Settlement. It arranged the Bengal Government into four branches, to be conducted by (1) the Board of Council, (2) a Military Board, (3) a Board of Revenue, (4) a Board of Trade. To each of these it assigned a separate constitution and definite duties. The Board of Revenue was to consist of one of the junior members of the Governor-General's Council, 'and four others of the most intelligent of the senior servants of the Company.'[2] The Governor-General was entitled to attend its meetings when he found time to do so. This part of the despatch concludes with an intimation that the Court had in view 'to arrange a final system' for transacting business with the zamíndárs and other landholders, and would transmit their sentiments 'in one of the early ships of this season.'[3] It is important to note this intimation in 1785, for it shows that the idea of a permanent arrangement for the revenues was no product of any preconception of Lord Cornwallis in favour of the landlord system of England; and that it had taken shape before Lord Cornwallis appeared upon the scene.

The despatch reached Calcutta in 1786, and early in the same year the Court of Directors communicated its final instructions. It assumed that sufficient informa-

[1] Quoted in Court of Directors' Letter, dated 12th April 1786. See also the complete clause in the Act.

[2] Court of Directors' Letter, dated 22nd Dec. 1785, para. 30.

[3] *Idem*, para. 36. The paragraphs are numbered as in the copy in the Home Department, Calcutta.

though 1781 is the accepted date of the recognition of the change, the process had been going on for some time previously, and it was not until some time later that it was completely carried out.

It is with the system thus inaugurated in 1781 that the present four volumes deal. The first settlement to which they refer was that of 1782–83;[1] and from various references it would appear that the assessment was fixed in many Districts at an increased rate. In 1784, the Governor-General, Warren Hastings, had the whole arrangements of the Board of Revenue for the settlement laid before him. He approved of the methods proposed, but animadverted upon a practice which seems to have grown up in certain Districts, of making the settlement for five years instead of one year, and quoted the orders of the Court of Directors expressly forbidding revenue leases being granted for a term of years.[2] Indeed, in 1783, a tender had been accepted from the Zamíndár of Dinájpur to hold his estate at a fixed and perpetual settlement.[3] The Governor-General directed that a clause limiting the term to one year only should thenceforth be inserted in all revenue leases throughout Bengal.[4]

I mention this as it discloses the views both of the Court of Directors and of the Bengal Government on the eve of another great change. Pitt's India Act of 1784 ordered an inquiry into the complaints of the dispossessed zamíndárs, and directed, *inter alia*, the Company to forthwith take steps 'for settling and establishing, upon principles of moderation and justice, according to the laws and constitution of India, the

[1] 1189, Bengal era.

[2] See Letter No. 722, Vol. I.

[3] Letter No. 571, Vol. I.

[4] Letter No. 722.

# CHAPTER II.

## THE STATE AND THE LANDHOLDERS.

LORD CORNWALLIS, therefore, on his arrival in 1786, found the two main questions regarding the rural administration decided beforehand. The first question had reference to the mechanism for bringing the British Control into direct contact with the cultivators. During the twenty years since the Imperial grant of Bengal in 1765, various methods had been attempted: Native agents in the Districts under a mixed British and Native Control at Murshidábád; British Supervisors in the Districts under two Provincial British and Native Councils at Murshidábád and Patna; a mixed British and Native agency in the Districts under a British control at Calcutta; Native agents or Amils in the Districts under the control of six British Provincial Councils; and finally a British agency of Collectors in the Districts, under the central control of a British Board of Revenue in Calcutta.

The other question had reference to the period for which the lands were to be leased to the zamíndárs. Letting by public auction had been tried, letting by private arrangement had been tried. Yearly settlements had been tried; then a settlement for five years; then yearly settlements again, with an inclination on the part of the District officers towards leases for a period of

tion had been collected during the twenty-one years since the Diwání grant of 1765 to enable a permanent arrangement for the land tax to be effected. It ordered that an assessment should be promptly fixed for ten years. At the end of that period, if the arrangement proved satisfactory, it was to be declared permanent. Lord Cornwallis was sent out as Governor-General in 1786, with increased powers, and with distinct orders to carry out these instructions. On his arrival, however, he found that the knowledge of the condition of the country possessed by the Board of Revenue in Calcutta, and by the Collectors in their respective Districts, was not yet equal to so great an undertaking. He therefore suspended the execution of the orders of the Court, and circulated interrogatories with the view of obtaining further data. In the meanwhile he continued the system of annual settlements for the land revenue.

the 12th April 1786, laying down the policy which Cornwallis was appointed to carry out, justified his recommendation. Paragraph 52 declared that the land assessment 'now to be formed shall, as soon as it can have received our approval and satisfaction, be considered as the permanent and unalterable revenue of our territorial possessions in Bengal; so that no discretion may be exercised by our servants abroad, in any case, of introducing any alteration whatsoever.' In 1792, the Court of Directors, with all the weighty objections to premature action fairly placed before them, declared the Settlement permanent.

If the popular idea that Cornwallis was the originator of the Permanent Settlement is erroneous, equally erroneous is the idea that he was sent out to impose on Bengal a system of landed property based upon our English notions of ownership. Pitt's Act of 1784, which was the starting-point of the Permanent Settlement, directed, indeed, that 'permanent rules' for the land rents and tributes should be made. But it directed those rules to be framed—(1) 'According to the circumstances of the respective cases of the said rájás, zamindárs, polygars, tálúkdárs, and other native landholders'; and (2) 'According to the laws and constitution of India.' The lengthy Despatch of the Court of Directors of the 12th April 1786 honestly endeavoured to give effect to what it termed 'the true spirit' and 'the humane intentions' of the Act. It lays down no rules based on preconceived British notions. It orders 'the settlement to be made in every practicable instance with the zamíndár,' but in special cases it admits the alternative of making it with a revenue farmer. For the purposes of the Despatch, the word Zamíndár simply

particular reference to three points.[1] First, to the amount of the assessment to be levied. Second, to the person with whom the settlement was to be made. Third, to rules for guarding against the oppression of the cultivators by the zamíndárs or by the under-farmers of the land tax. The investigation of these three subjects occupied the District Officers during the next two years, and I briefly summarise the results.

First, as to the amount of the assessment to be levied. Under the Muhammadan systems, which preceded British rule, the proportion of the crop claimed for the State is variously estimated at one-third, two-fifths, and three-fifths of the gross produce. Sir Thomas Munro, with the fullest knowledge ever brought to bear on the subject, came to the conclusion that the amount taken in practice was about one-half. Sir John Shore estimated that, for the purposes of the Permanent Settlement of Bengal, the British Government received 45 per cent. of the gross produce, the zamíndár and his under-renters 15 per cent., and the cultivator 40 per cent.[2]

As a matter of fact such estimates were of little value. For the nominal amount under native rule was increased by two sets of *abwábs* or cesses, the one set imposed by the Provincial Governments, the other by the Zamíndárs.[3] In the aggregate, so much was generally taken by the State as to leave no margin which would give a selling value to the land, beyond that of the crop upon it. In Bengal, the province with which alone I at present deal, there never had been a detailed settlement by an exact measurement of the land and assessment of

[1] Letter No. 1307, Vol. I. [2] Minute of 8th Dec. 1789, para. 5.

[3] Known respectively in popular language as the *Súbahdárí abwábs*, and the *Karcha*, or 'expenses' for the zamíndárs.

meant the person (whatever might be his exact status) with whom, according to the native custom, the settlement would have been made. The Despatch did not prejudge the status of the zamíndár or of any of the classes interested in the soil. It directed its servants, in regard to the whole question of land rights, to ascertain 'the constitution and customs of the Muhammadan or Hindu Government.' To this end it ordered 'a set of queries, accommodated to local circumstances,' to be addressed to experienced natives throughout Bengal.

As regards the plan of civil administration, the Directors expressly declared that they had been actuated by the necessity of accommodating 'their views and interests to the subsisting manners and usages of the people, rather than by any abstract theories drawn from other countries, or applicable to a different state of things.'[1]

While, therefore, Lord Cornwallis was sent out to introduce a permanent settlement, it was to be a settlement according to the laws and customs of India, and according to the local system of land rights in Bengal.

On his arrival in September 1786, Lord Cornwallis soon discovered that preliminary inquiries were required of a nature at once more elaborate and more exact than the Court of Directors had supposed needful. Accordingly, at the beginning of 1787, circular letters were addressed to the District officers, calling for reports on the recent history and practical working on the system then in force.[2] These reports were duly considered, and in August of the same year instructions issued for forming a land settlement for a term of years, and with

[1] See also the Fifth Report, Vol. I. p. 15. Madras Reprint, 1886.
[2] See for example Letter No. 1255, Vol. I. p. 139.

particular reference to three points.[1] First, to the amount of the assessment to be levied. Second, to the person with whom the settlement was to be made. Third, to rules for guarding against the oppression of the cultivators by the zamíndárs or by the under-farmers of the land tax. The investigation of these three subjects occupied the District Officers during the next two years, and I briefly summarise the results.

First, as to the amount of the assessment to be levied. Under the Muhammadan systems, which preceded British rule, the proportion of the crop claimed for the State is variously estimated at one-third, two-fifths, and three-fifths of the gross produce. Sir Thomas Munro, with the fullest knowledge ever brought to bear on the subject, came to the conclusion that the amount taken in practice was about one-half. Sir John Shore estimated that, for the purposes of the Permanent Settlement of Bengal, the British Government received 45 per cent. of the gross produce, the zamíndár and his under-renters 15 per cent., and the cultivator 40 per cent.[2]

As a matter of fact such estimates were of little value. For the nominal amount under native rule was increased by two sets of *abwábs* or cesses, the one set imposed by the Provincial Governments, the other by the Zamíndárs.[3] In the aggregate, so much was generally taken by the State as to leave no margin which would give a selling value to the land, beyond that of the crop upon it. In Bengal, the province with which alone I at present deal, there never had been a detailed settlement by an exact measurement of the land and assessment of

[1] Letter No. 1307, Vol. I. [2] Minute of 8th Dec. 1789, para. 5.

[3] Known respectively in popular language as the *Súbahdárí abwábs*, and the *Karcha*, or 'expenses' for the zamíndárs.

the field. Even Akbar had to be content with assessing the villages as a whole, and on the basis of the reports of the village accountants.[1] All that the East India Company's servants were able to do was, to find out what land tax the various zamíndárís and fiscal divisions had as a matter of fact paid; and to take that as the fair assessment. This was the practical basis of the Permanent Settlement of Bengal. There was no 'survey and settlement' in the modern Indian sense of the term. There was no attempt to measure the individual field and to estimate its average produce. Indeed, the unit of the settlement was the estate of the zamíndár, not the holding of the cultivator; and the general standard was the amount of land revenue the estate had paid as a whole, not the amount which its individual lands were capable of paying. The inquiry seldom penetrated below the *parganá*, or fiscal division, and never beneath the village, or associated rural commune. 'Minute local scrutinies were objected to as contrary to the orders of the Court of Directors.'[2]

So much for Lord Cornwallis' first subject of inquiry—the method and amount of the assessment.

The second branch of his investigation, as to the person with whom the settlement should be made, opened up a wider scope for controversy. The records show that there were five different classes of claimants in the field. First, the *Zamíndár*, or landholder in the Indian sense of the term, who claimed a customary right (whatever might be the origin or actual incidents of that

[1] Among the outlying provinces or *subahs* of the Mughal Empire, not measured by Akbar's officers, were Bengal and part of Behar.

[2] John Shore's Minute of the 18th June 1789, paras. 273–276. I deal more fully with this aspect in Chapter V. pp. 85–88.

right), to engage for the land revenue of a certain area. I shall presently show how diverse were the titles under which even the acknowledged Zamíndárs claimed this customary right. Second, the *Talúkdárs*, or intermediate holders between a Zamíndár and the cultivators. Third, the revenue farmers, who had practically done the work of collecting the revenue in many Zamíndárís and fiscal divisions (*parganás*) during the previous 15 or 20 years, and who had acquired a certain prescriptive status, although not a prescriptive right equal to that of an old zamíndár. Fourth, military and other holders of lands, held rent revenue free, or at a low land tax, on the ground of services rendered to, or of grants obtained from, the Native Governments previous to the accession of the East India Company. Fifth, the holders of lands, granted either free of revenue, or at a low land tax, for charitable, educational, or religious purposes; such as temple lands, mosque lands, Sanskrit college lands, and many other tenures of a like nature. The records prove that there was no general claim by village communes, or by coparcenary cultivating bodies, to engage direct with the Government for the land tax in Lower Bengal and Behar.

It is beyond the scope of this essay to detail the measures adopted in regard to the various classes of tenure-holders. Much interesting information will be found regarding each of them, under the respective headings in the index at the end of my Volume IV. Broadly speaking, the net result of the Permanent Settlement was to give a legislative status to each class, in place of uncertain and often conflicting rights based on custom. The central idea in dealing with rival claims to engage for the land revenue was as far as possible to continue

the system found actually existing. I say as far as possible, for the conflict of the alleged customary rights of certain of the classes rendered a legislative settlement impossible, except on the principle of give and take. Thus the Tálúkdárs, or intermediate holders, were separated by a hard-and-fast line into two classes, one of which was empowered by law to pay the land revenue direct to the District treasury, while the other had to pay it through the superior landholder or Zamíndár. Grants before 1765, and Táluks which had paid a fixed assessment for twelve years, were protected from increase.[1] In the same way definite rules were applied to the very various classes of service tenures and revenue-free, or partially revenue-free, grants.[2]

The largest and most important body of tenure-holders dealt with by the inquiry were the Zamíndárs. From the letters cited in Volume I., it is clear that elaborate inquiries were instituted into the actual status of the zamíndárs, and much trouble was taken to discover the character and extent of their rights over their estates. For the purposes of administration, almost the only thing absolutely ascertained about the zamíndárs, previous to these inquiries, was their hereditary customary right to engage for the collection of the land revenue, if they would agree to the amount assessed on their estates. But that customary right, although inherent in all, had widely different sources of origin, and was possessed in different degrees of force by the various classes of zamíndárs. The truth is, that the word Zamíndár was, in the official nomenclature of Bengal,

[1] Letters No. 1784, 1800, etc., Vol. I.

[2] See in index (Vol. IV.), under such headings as AIMA, ALIENATED LANDS, ALTAMGHA CHAKRAN, JAGIR, etc.

merely a convenient general term which included landholders and tenure-holders of several separate kinds, who were entitled to hold directly under the State, and to pay the land tax directly to it.

The first class of Bengal zamíndárs represented the old Hindu and Muhammadan rájás of the country, previous to the Mughal conquest by the Emperor Akbar in 1576, or persons who claimed that status.[1] The second class were rájás or great landholders, most of whom dated from the 17th and 18th centuries, and some of whom were, like the first class, *de facto* rulers in their own estates or territories, subject to a tribute or land tax to the representative of the Emperor. These two classes had a social position faintly resembling the Feudatory Chiefs of the British Indian Empire, but that position was enjoyed by them on the basis of custom, not of treaties. The third and most numerous class were persons whose families had held the office of collecting the revenue during one, or two, or more generations, and who had thus established a prescriptive right. A fourth and also numerous class was made up of the revenue farmers, who, since the Diwání Grant in 1765, had collected the land tax for the East India Company, under the system first of yearly leases, then of five-years' leases, and again of yearly leases. Many of these revenue farmers had by 1787 acquired the *de facto* status of zamíndárs.

It is these fundamental differences in origin which have led to such contradictory statements, alike in Indian history and in the Indian law-courts, as to the title of the Bengal zamíndárs. The result of the

[1] Replies by Mirza Mohsen to Mr. Boughton Rouse's list of questions; given *in extenso*, Rouse's *Dissertation*, p. 49, 1791.

the system found actually existing. I say as far as possible, for the conflict of the alleged customary rights of certain of the classes rendered a legislative settlement impossible, except on the principle of give and take. Thus the Tálúkdárs, or intermediate holders, were separated by a hard-and-fast line into two classes, one of which was empowered by law to pay the land revenue direct to the District treasury, while the other had to pay it through the superior landholder or Zamíndár. Grants before 1765, and Táluks which had paid a fixed assessment for twelve years, were protected from increase.[1] In the same way definite rules were applied to the very various classes of service tenures and revenue-free, or partially revenue-free, grants.[2]

The largest and most important body of tenure-holders dealt with by the inquiry were the Zamíndárs. From the letters cited in Volume I., it is clear that elaborate inquiries were instituted into the actual status of the zamíndárs, and much trouble was taken to discover the character and extent of their rights over their estates. For the purposes of administration, almost the only thing absolutely ascertained about the zamíndárs, previous to these inquiries, was their hereditary customary right to engage for the collection of the land revenue, if they would agree to the amount assessed on their estates. But that customary right, although inherent in all, had widely different sources of origin, and was possessed in different degrees of force by the various classes of zamíndárs. The truth is, that the word Zamíndár was, in the official nomenclature of Bengal,

[1] Letters No. 1784, 1800, etc., Vol. I.

[2] See in index (Vol. IV.), under such headings as AIMA, ALIENATED LANDS, ALTAMGHA CHAKRAN, JAGIR, etc.

merely a convenient general term which included landholders and tenure-holders of several separate kinds, who were entitled to hold directly under the State, and to pay the land tax directly to it.

The first class of Bengal zamíndárs represented the old Hindu and Muhammadan rájás of the country, previous to the Mughal conquest by the Emperor Akbar in 1576, or persons who claimed that status.[1] The second class were rájás or great landholders, most of whom dated from the 17th and 18th centuries, and some of whom were, like the first class, *de facto* rulers in their own estates or territories, subject to a tribute or land tax to the representative of the Emperor. These two classes had a social position faintly resembling the Feudatory Chiefs of the British Indian Empire, but that position was enjoyed by them on the basis of custom, not of treaties. The third and most numerous class were persons whose families had held the office of collecting the revenue during one, or two, or more generations, and who had thus established a prescriptive right. A fourth and also numerous class was made up of the revenue farmers, who, since the Diwání Grant in 1765, had collected the land tax for the East India Company, under the system first of yearly leases, then of five-years' leases, and again of yearly leases. Many of these revenue farmers had by 1787 acquired the *de facto* status of zamíndărs.

It is these fundamental differences in origin which have led to such contradictory statements, alike in Indian history and in the Indian law-courts, as to the title of the Bengal zamíndárs. The result of the

[1] Replies by Mirza Mohsen to Mr. Boughton Rouse's list of questions; given *in extenso*, Rouse's *Dissertation*, p. 49, 1791.

Permanent Settlement in 1793 was to place all classes of zamíndárs on a uniform legal basis, and so in a short time to obliterate the previous differences in the customary status of the several classes, differences in customary status which had grown out of differences in origin. Even before the Permanent Settlement, the revenue farming system adopted by the East India Company from 1769 to 1788 had tended to obscure such differences. For the effect of the farming system was to level down the ancient zamíndárs and to level up the revenue farmers into new zamíndárs.

It was therefore possible, in the inquiries which took place from 1787 to 1790, for one set of officers to come to the conclusion that the zamíndárs were little more than agents of the Government for the collection of the land-tax; while another set of officers declared them to be the actual hereditary possessors of their estates, subject to the payment of the land tax to Government. Mr. Grant, speaking with all the authority of *Sarrishtadár*, or Chief Record Keeper of Bengal, had described them 'as no more than annual contracting farmers or receivers of the public rents.' Mr. Boughton Rouse devoted a volume to maintaining that 'a general state of hereditary property' existed in Bengal,[1] and was vested in the zamíndárs. If this irreconcilable conflict of opinion arose among honest observers at the time, it is not surprising that the views of Indian historians, and the pleas of Indian lawyers, should be equally contradictory at a later period, after the wave of the Permanent Settlement had passed over Bengal, and submerged the pre-existing state of things.

[1] *Dissertation concerning the Landed Property of Bengal*, by Charles William Boughton Rouse, Esq., p. 20. London, 1791.

Before the Permanent Settlement, it was possible to name twelve traditional Bhúyan or 'original' zamíndárs of Bengal, who held a hereditary status in their respective territories.[1] There were also half-subdued chiefs, sometimes of ancient standing, who had not been brought under the administrative system of the Mughal Government in Bengal, such as the Rájás of Tipperah, Kúch Behar, and Assam. There were others too powerful to be controlled, and who had either been exempted from full subjection, like the frontier rájás of Bírbhúm and Bishnupur;[2] or who won for themselves a partial and intermittent exemption by armed resistance, like the Rájá of Bardwan in the heart of the province, and many smaller zamíndárs in its outlying and frontier districts. Such zamíndárs held princely courts, maintained their own bodies of armed followers, dispensed justice in their territories or estates, and handed down their position from father to son. But all of them paid a tribute or a land tax to the Muhammadan Government at Murshidábád, and as a rule, in cases of death, the heir deemed it prudent to obtain from that Government an official acknowledgment of his succession. Such zamíndárs had clearly a title to their estates, differing from that of mere revenue agents of the Ruling Power. But it was difficult to formulate the difference: for they represented many degrees of independence and of customary status, from hill-chiefs or trans-frontier rájás who never paid tribute except when an army advanced against them, to the wardens of the marches and other powerful zamíndárs, who paid as little and as seldom as they dared.

The reason for this anomalous state of things is to

1 Mirza Mohsen's list in Rouse's *Dissertation*, p. 50.

2 By the Muhammadan Viceroy, Munshid Kúlí Khán, 1704–1726.

be found in the political history of the Lower Provinces. The part of Bengal which passed under the Company's administration by the Diwání grant of 1765 had never been strictly subjected to the revenue system of the Mughal Empire. Imperfectly conquered by the early Delhi power in 1203, its governors threw off the northern yoke in 1340. During the next two hundred years Lower Bengal was ruled by a succession of twenty independent kings, who relied to some extent on the local rájás and zamíndárs to maintain them against external attack or reconquest. In the sixteenth century, Lower Bengal formed the arena of the final struggle in India between the Afgháns and Mughals. After its conquest by Akbar in 1576, it became an outlying province of the Mughal Empire, into which even that great sovereign did not find it possible to carry out his detailed revenue settlement.

During the following century, the seventeenth, Lower Bengal presented a scene of frequent disturbances and dynastic struggles. About the middle of that century it was described by the traveller Bernier as a "quantité de pais dont le Mogol n'est pas trop le Maître." "La guerre est presque toujours de ce côté-là." Every territorial magnate became as independent as he could; and every important zamíndár tried to set up as a territorial magnate. Under the Emperor Aurangzeb, 1658–1707, Akbar's village settlement (such as it had been) was partially given up, and the primitive system of Ala-ud-dín Khiljí (1295–1315), which consisted in taking one half the produce on the threshing-floor, was in places resorted to. At length, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, Lower Bengal came under the sway of a strong and despotic governor, Murshid Kúlí Khán (1704–1726), who dispossessed many of the zamíndárs, and enforced

the central authority on all of them as it had never been enforced before. John Shore stated that between 1704 and 1789 at least one-half the property of Bengal changed hands owing to defalcations of the revenue.

The Bengal zamíndárs, at the Permanent Settlement, represented the heterogeneous results of two sets of influences: the long-continued weakness of the Provincial Government which made for their independence down to the end of the seventeenth century; and the stringent fiscal policy of Murshid Kúlí Khán in the early part of the eighteenth century, followed by the farming system of the East India Company from 1769 to 1789, which tended to reduce the zamíndárs to mere agents for the collection of the land tax. It was this composite body of zamíndárs that the Permanent Settlement suddenly resolved to deal with as a homogeneous whole.

There was, however, one respect in which all zamíndárs held the same position in the eye of the Government. It was admitted that each of them rested his title as zamíndár on a *sanad*, or letter of authorisation from the State, to collect the land revenues. Even Mr. Boughton Rouse, the strongest advocate of zamíndárí rights, acknowledged this at the time of the Permanent Settlement. 'At present,' he wrote, 'every zamíndár, whatever be the mode of acquiring his land, holds it under a *sanad* or patent from the Government, in the Persian language, minutely describing the lands comprised within his zamíndárí.'[1] One at least of such patents dated from the revenue arrangements of Akbar towards the end of the sixteenth century;[2] but, in the opinion of the most

[1] *Dissertation concerning the Landed Property of Bengal*, p. 38, 1791.

[2] Consultations of Bengal Revenue Committee in 1786, quoted by Rouse, p. 38.

competent authority, Mr. James Grant, their general introduction into Lower Bengal belonged to the reign of Aurangzeb during the second half of the seventeenth. However this may be, John Shore was sufficiently correct in stating in 1788 that 'most of the considerable zamíndárs in Bengal may be traced to an origin within the last century and a half.'[1] The sources and dates of their proprietary claims have an historical interest. But, practically, by the time that the East India Company acquired the Diwání of Bengal in 1765, the official title of the Bengal zamíndárs as a whole had merged into a title by *sanad*, and each *sanad* set forth the character and incidents of the position thus granted.

That position was explicitly stated to be the *khidmat*, 'office' or 'duty' of collecting the land revenue within a certain area; and a counterpart engagement with a security bond had to be given by the zamíndár for the due execution of this office. The *sanad* was granted to the person named in it, without mention of heirs, and conveyed no right of transference or inheritance. But, as a matter of custom, zamíndárís were transferred both by sale and inheritance, the purchaser or the heir obtaining a fresh *sanad* from the Government on the payment of fees and a *peshkash* or fine to the State.[2] All this is clearly proved by the evidence of contemporary writers, and by the text of the *sanads* themselves which have come down to us. The registration of such grants was a subject of attention, not merely for the Board of Revenue, but for the Governor-General in Council.[3]

Take, for example, the *sanad* to Chaitan Singh, Rájá of Bishnupur (Bishenpore), whose history I have given

[1] Minute of 2nd April 1788. [2] Letter No. 1225, Vol. I.
[3] See, for instance, Letter No. 5281, Vol. II.

from the local manuscript records in another work.[1] The Family-Book of the Bishnupur rájás displays their descent from 715 A.D., and they had held their principality, which was about the size of Wales, long before the annexation of Bengal to the Mughal Empire in 1576. During the greater part of the Mughal supremacy, the Bishnupur rájás were practically tributary princes who kept the western frontier of Lower Bengal against the hillmen. Even under the severe fiscal policy of Mushid Kúlí Khán (1704–1726), the Bishnupur rájá was one of the two magnates exempted from its despotic regulations. The other was the adjoining Rájá of Bírbhúm; and these two wardens of the western marches continued to hold their territories at easy rates after Bengal passed to the East India Company in 1765. It would be impossible to cite a case in which the title to a zamíndárí estate depended less upon official grant, and more upon hereditary right. Yet the Rájás of Bishnupur technically held by *sanad* like all other Bengal zamíndárs, and the *sanad* granted to Rájá Chaitan Singh in 1780, at the beginning of the period with which my four volumes deal, sets forth precisely the status of the rájá as 'zamíndár of *pargana* Bishnupur.'

It is in form a proclamation to the revenue officers and intermediate holders and cultivators, that 'the office of zamíndár of the aforesaid *pargana* has been bestowed, agreeable to the endorsement, from the beginning of the year 1187, Bengal era,[2] to the cream of his peers, Chaitan Singh, the grandson of Gopal Sing, zamíndár, deceased, on his consenting to pay the royal *peshkash*, etc., of 186

[1] *Annals of Rural Bengal*, and particularly its Appendix E, p. 439, 5th ed. 1872.

[2] 1780 A.D.

mohars[1] and 2 anas. It is required of him that, having executed with propriety the duties and function of his station, he be not deficient in the smallest respect in diligence and assiduity, but observing a conciliatory conduct towards the ráiyats (cultivators) and inhabitants at large, and exerting himself to the utmost in punishing and expelling the refractory: Let him pay the revenue of Government into the treasury at the stated periods, let him encourage the body of the ráiyats in such a manner that signs of an increased cultivation and improvement of the country may daily appear, and let him keep the high roads in such repair that travellers may pass and repass in the fullest confidence and security.

'Let there be no robberies or murders committed within his boundaries; but (God forbid) should any one notwithstanding be robbed or plundered of his property, let him produce the thieves, together with the stolen property, and, after restoring the latter to the rightful owner, let him assign the former over to punishment. Should he fail in producing the parties offending, he must himself make good the property stolen. Let him be careful that no one be guilty of misconduct in his behaviour, or commit irregularities of any kind. Let him transmit the accounts required of him to the *Húzúr* (chief revenue office), under his own and the Kánúngos' signature; and, after having paid up the whole revenues completely to the end of the year, let him receive credit for the *Maskúrát* (allowances to the zamíndár), agreeably to usage; and, finally, let him refrain from the collection of any of the *abwáb* abolished or prohibited by Government.'

'It is required of the aforesaid *mutasaddís* (revenue officials), that, having acknowledged the said Person

[1] 2976 rupees.

Zamíndár of the above-mentioned *pargana*, they consider him as invested with the powers and functions appertaining to that office.'

A schedule attached to the *sanad* gives the names of the fiscal divisions granted, but without any measurement or particulars as to their area or boundaries, and states their land tax at Rs. 129,903, 'agreeably to the accounts signed by the *kánúngos*,' or local accountants, 'of the *pargana* Bishnupur.'

The Rájá Chaitan Singh executed a counterpart agreement[1] as follows:—'Whereas the Office of Zamíndár of the aforesaid *pargana* has been bestowed on me[2] from the beginning of 1187, Bengal era, on my consenting to pay the royal *peshkash* of 186 mohars and 2 anas, I do of my free will and accord enter into the engagement and written obligation, that, having executed with propriety the duties and functions of my station, I will not be deficient in the smallest respect in diligence and assiduity, but observing a mild and conciliatory conduct towards the ráiyats (cultivators) and inhabitants at large, and exerting myself to the utmost in punishing and expelling the refractory: I will pay the revenues of government into the treasury at the stated periods. I will encourage the body of ráiyats in such a manner, that signs of an increased cultivation and improvement of the country may daily appear. I will keep the high roads in such repair, that travellers may pass and repass in the fullest confidence and security.

'There shall be no robberies or murders committed within my boundaries; but (God forbid) should any one

[1] The *kabriliyat*, from *kabríl*, literally 'consent.'

[2] From Letter No. 148, Vol. I. p. 43, it appears that a new bid for the zamíndárí of Bishnupur was made by a large revenue farmer in June 1782.

notwithstanding be robbed or plundered of his property, I will produce the thieves, together with the stolen property, and, after restoring the latter to the rightful owner, I will consign the former over to punishment. Should I fail in producing the parties offending, I myself will make good the property stolen. I will be careful that no one be guilty of misconduct in his behaviour, or commit irregularities of any kind. I will transmit the accounts required of me to the *Húzúr*, under my own and the Kánúngos' signature; and, after having paid up the whole revenues completely to the end of the year, I will receive credit for the *Maskúrát*, agreeably to usage; and, finally, I will refrain from the collection of any of the *abwáb* which have been abolished or prohibited by Government.'

The security bond attached to this counterpart engagement is given by the chief registrar or 'Kánúngo of Bengal,' and runs as follows:—'Having become security to Government for his (the Rájá Chaitan Singh's) appearance, (I) do engage and bind myself that, in case the aforesaid person should abscond, I will produce him, and in event of my not being able to do so, I myself will be responsible for his engagements.' That this security bond was no empty form, is proved by the fact that within a short period the letters now summarised from the MS. records disclose the rájá in arrears of his revenue. In 1791 part of his lands were to be sold, and the zamíndár himself was in confinement for balances due to the Government.[1]

I have reproduced the essential portions of the *sanad* and counter-engagement of the Rájá of Bishnupur

[1] See, among other Letters, No. 1987, Vol. I.

for two reasons.[1] In the first place, they exhibit the common form of title under which the Bengal zamíndárs held in the last century; even zamíndárs like the Rájá of Bishnupur, whose tenure dated from before the Mughal conquest of Bengal, and who, after that conquest, had for a time enjoyed a status which was acknowledged to be independent of any official grant from the Mughal Government. The *sanad* by which the zamíndárí of certain *parganas* was granted to the East India Company in 1757-58, contained the same particulars and ran substantially in the same form.[2] In the second place, it shows that this common form of official title, under which all Bengal zamíndárs held during the last century, did not correctly represent, in cases of old zamíndárs like the Bishnupur Rájá, the status which they *de facto* enjoyed. Their *de facto* status was that of ancient hereditary lords of certain tracts: a status which enabled them to levy great incomes, to transfer their lands by sale, and to transmit them to their descendants, subject to the payment of the customary fees to the sovereign Power. In 1757, even after the battle of Plassey, we find the Rájá of Bishnupur exacting duties from the English themselves, in spite of the orders of the submissive Nawáb or Native Viceroy of Bengal.[3]

As a matter of fact, therefore, the Bengal zamíndárs of the Bishnupur type occupied a double position: the position of revenue collectors under their *sanad*, and the

[1] With their annexures and schedules they occupy eleven pages of Appendix II. to Rouse's *Dissertation concerning the Landed Property of Bengal*, pp. 221-231, 1791.

[2] Aitchison's *Treaties, Engagements, and Sunnuds*, vol. i. pp. 19-29. Foreign Office Press, Calcutta, ed. 1876.

[3] *Home Department Records;* Proceedings of November 3, 1757. No. 252 in Long's *Selections*. Government Press, Calcutta, 1869.

position of hereditary territorial magnates. By their *sanad*, or official title, they were simply agents of the Government for specified purposes, holding their lands in order to collect the land tax; and their emoluments were specifically limited to certain allowances, estimated at ten to fifteen per cent. of the land tax. Under their title, by custom, they regarded themselves as the ancient lords of their estates, subject to the payment of the land tax; and, as a matter of fact, they raised by various means a sufficient income to maintain their local courts with more or less pomp, sometimes indeed with princely magnificence.

It is this double title, by *sanad* and by custom, which explains the anomalies so puzzling to British legislators in the last century, and which lies at the root of much debate in the law-courts of Bengal during the present one. A zamíndárí estate was *de facto* so important a possession, that even Murshid Kúlí Khán, the despotic viceroy of Bengal from 1704 to 1726, deemed it wise to acquire one as a provision for his family. For he knew that his accumulated treasures and personal property might be claimed by the Mughal Government on his decease, while a zamíndárí estate would pass to his heirs, subject to a comparatively small succession payment (*peshkash*). A deed of private sale of land[1] mentioned the posterity of the purchaser as a bar to any future claims of the vendor or his descendants. But in a Government grant or *sanad* for a zamíndárí, there was no mention of the posterity of the grantee. The selling price of a zamíndárí was small, and in recorded cases it did not exceed one year's amount of the land tax

[1] *E.g.* Deed of sale for a small *táluk* near Calcutta, dated 1715-16; reproduced in full as Appendix V. to Rouse's *Dissertation*, 1791.

—or one year's arrears of the land tax. For the land tax was so heavy, and the incidents of the official title by *sanad* so onerous, as to prevent zamíndárí estates from acquiring the high value of many years' purchase which they obtained under the Permanent Settlement of 1793.

The actual working of this double basis of title was fairly, if vaguely, indicated by Warren Hastings in 1786, when he refused 'to distinguish between right, fact, and form as applied to' the zamíndárs. 'I do not mean,' he said, 'to contest their right of inheritance to the lands, whilst I assert the right of Government to the produce thereof. The Muhammadan rulers continually exercised, with a severity unknown to the British administration in Bengal, the power of dispossessing the zamíndárs on any failure in the payment of their rents, not only *pro tempore*, but in perpetuity.'[1] He then shows how this process led not only to the disintegration of old estates, but also to the growth of new ones. 'The zamíndárí of Rajsháhí, the second in rank in Bengal, and yielding an annual revenue of about twenty-five lákhs of rupees,'[2] he declares, 'has risen to its present magnitude during the course of the last eighty years, by accumulating the property of a great number of dispossessed zamíndárs; although the ancestors of the present possessor had not, by inheritance, a right to the property of a single village within the whole zamíndárí.' The armed disorders, and disputed claims in a recent zamíndárí of this class, may be traced in the letters summarised in the present

[1] Review of the State of Bengal in 1786; one of the last of the great Minutes recorded by Warren Hastings at the close of his Governor-Generalship. Quoted in *The Zemindary Settlement of Bengal*, 2 vols. Calcutta, 1879; vol. i. Appendix VI. p. 109.

[2] Then equal to over £250,000.

volumes, from 1782 onwards.[1] I have cited the case of Rájsháhí, for it exhibited the modern type of a great Bengal zamíndárí, as contrasted with the ancient type represented by Bishnupur.

The framers of the Permanent Settlement had therefore not only to deal with a heterogeneous body of zamíndárs differing as to historical origin and actual status: they had also to deal with a double basis of title, based upon *sanad* (or official grant) and upon custom. They endeavoured to get rid of all such complexities, whether of origin, status, or title, by establishing a uniform tenure for all zamíndárs. This new system of tenure they conceived in a liberal spirit, with a view to give effect to all rights which any zamíndár had *de facto* enjoyed. Starting from the title by *sanad*, they limited for ever the land tax which each zamíndár could be called to pay; and, in addition to the old 'allowances,' they made over in perpetuity to the zamíndár whatever increment he might obtain from increased cultivation from the reclamation of waste lands, then amounting to one-third of the area of Bengal,[2] and from improvements of his estate. With these increased rights, derived from the title by *sanad*, the Permanent Settlement incorporated the right enjoyed under the old title by custom, namely, the right to transfer zamíndárí estates whether by sale or inheritance. It also freed such transfers from any payment (*peshkash*) to the State. Out of the imperfect or inchoate rights formerly enjoyed, whether by *sanad* or custom, it built

[1] For example, see Letters Nos. 30, 52, 69, 151, 250, 426, 786, 788, 1460, 1463, all between the years 1782 and 1789, and previous to the actual introduction of the Decennial Settlement into the Rájsháhí Zamíndárí.

[2] See *post*, pp. 51 and 78.

up a complete proprietary title, saleable, heritable, and subject only to the payment of a fixed land tax.

At the time it seemed that the Ruling Power had, by divesting itself for ever of certain of its own rights, levelled up the zamíndárs of the modern type to the highest status claimed by the zamíndárs of the ancient historical type. We shall see in Chapter V. how unforeseen influences intervened between the liberal intentions of the framers of the Permanent Settlement and the beneficial results which they expected to accrue to the zamíndár. They had, in fact, a quite inadequate conception of the consequences involved by the sudden substitution of a clear-cut statutory title for the indefinite double title by *sanad* and by custom. But the same may be said of the actors in all the great events in the history of British rule in India. The servants of the Company won battles, made treaties, and constructed codes, with scarcely a presentiment of the far-reaching results.

But the evidence now brought forward renders one thing clear. The Permanent Settlement of Bengal was neither consciously nor unconsciously an imitation of the English system of landed property. Lord Cornwallis carried out in good faith, and with due care and caution, the injunction of Pitt's Act of 1784, and the instructions of the Court of Directors based thereon in 1786, to establish permanent rules for the land revenue, 'according to the laws and constitution of India.' Those laws and that constitution Cornwallis endeavoured to ascertain by detailed local inquiry from 1787 to 1789. Amid much conflict, to repeat the words of Warren Hastings, 'between right, fact, and form,' the double status of the zamíndárs by official grant and by custom indistinctly emerged.

This practical recognition of the twofold source of

the zamíndárs' title, and this absence of clear views concerning it, lay at the root of many anomalies in the Permanent Settlement. It is easy, for example, to quote declarations by Lord Cornwallis which, without this clue, seem inconsistent with each other. Thus in his Minute of the 3rd February 1790, when speaking of the alleged proprietary rights of the zamíndárs, he stated: 'I conceive that a more nugatory or delusive species of property could hardly exist';—a perfectly accurate statement from the point of view of their official title by *sanad*. Yet he expressly admitted,[1] and gave legislative effect to, their proprietary rights; and he was justified in so doing by their actual position based upon custom. From the inchoate rights and usages of this double status, by a grant and by custom, Lord Cornwallis developed a uniform statutory title for the landholders of Bengal. This statutory title bore a superficial similarity to the land system of England; a similarity which doctrinaire economists at home mistook for, and an *à priori* historian exaggerated into, an intended imitation.

[1] 'I admit the proprietary rights of the zamíndárs.'—Lord Cornwallis' Minute of 3rd February 1790, Fifth Report, App. V. p. 622. Madras Reprint, 1866.

# CHAPTER III.

## THE LANDHOLDERS AND THE CULTIVATORS.

I HAVE so far dealt with land right in Bengal as a question between the Government and the zamíndárs. But there was another body of land rights and usages, vested neither in the Government nor in the zamíndárs, but in the cultivators. These rights of the actual tiller of the soil, or ráiyat, the East India Company's servants in Bengal had from the first declared their resolve to uphold.

When in 1757–58 they received the grant or *sanad* for the lands referred to at p. 41, their instructions to the subordinate revenue farmers commenced with the following words:—'That the rents are not to be increased on the ráiyats of the present tenanted (*sic*) for ráiyatí grounds.'[1] After obtaining the Diwání grant in 1765, the regulations for the native collectors enjoined that 'what can be collected without injury to the ráiyats you are to collect and forward to me;' and that inquiries were to be made as to 'what further benefits can accrue to the Company without laying the ráiyats under hardships, it being the Company's intention that they should enjoy ease and comfort.'[2] On the Company's first

[1] Proceedings of May 21, 1759, *Home Department Records*, Calcutta.

[2] Proceedings of October 1, 1767, *Home Department Records*, Calcutta.

attempt at rural administration by British officers in 1769, it directed the cultivator to be assured 'in the most forcible and convincing manner' 'that our object is not increase of rents, or the accumulation of demands, but solely by fixing such as are legal, explaining and abolishing such as are fraudulent and unauthorised, not only to redress his present grievances, but to secure him from all further invasions of his property.'[1] When, towards the expiry of the five years' leases in 1777, the land administration was to pass more directly under the Company's control, the Governor-General instituted inquiries with a view 'to secure to the ráiyats the perpetual and undisturbed possession of their lands.'[2] Ten years later, the protection of the cultivators formed, as we have seen, the third main branch of the instructions issued by Lord Cornwallis to the District officers, with a view to framing a long-term settlement for Bengal.[3]

What was this 'property' or 'possession' vested in the cultivators? Broadly speaking, it consisted in a hereditary right to continue to cultivate their fields as long as they paid the land tax and other dues leviable by custom upon them. This is perhaps as correct a generalisation as can be framed. But generalisations are extremely dangerous when applied to so mixed a body as the cultivators of Lower Bengal. For not only were there several distinct classes of cultivators, but also a variety of customs which regulated the amount leviable from each class.

[1] Proceedings of President and Select Committee (Bengal), 16th August 1769.

[2] Warren Hastings, 1st November 1776; *Selections from East India House Records*, 1820, Folio i. p. 436.

[3] Letter No. 1307, Vol. I.

At the outset only two things are clear:—First, in its liberal arrangements with the zamíndárs, the Government could properly give away no more than it possessed, that is, its own interest in the land so far as it went, and no further. Second, the interest of the Government in the land was limited by certain possessory rights vested in the cultivators.

In considering the various degrees of possessory right vested in the cultivators, it will simplify matters if we at once exclude certain classes of 'privileged' cultivators. The chief 'privileged' class were Bráhmans and others of other good caste, who held at lower rents than the ordinary body of cultivators. I have dealt fully with this class in another work.[1] Such 'privileged' classes paid rent, calculated in some localities at one-eighth of the produce, while the surrounding cultivators paid at the rate of one-half to three-fifths. In other districts they paid half the ordinary rate. Their holdings included not only tenures granted for various purposes,[2] but also land held by them as 'mere cultivators.'[3] In the Benares Province, then, under the Bengal Board of Revenue, they were so numerous, that 'the Government had sustained a real prejudice, the more serious as' 'on the smallest attempt to exert any coercion over them, they were always ready with knives and razors to lacerate their own bodies.'[4] These classes of privileged cultivators were recognised by Muhammadan law as well as by Hindu custom. The main difference was

[1] *Orissa*, 2 vols.; vol. i. pp. 33, 34, 37, 54; vol. ii. pp. 255, 256. London 1872.

[2] Such as are referred to in Letters 31, 172, 1698, vol. i., and in many other Letters summarised in these volumes.

[3] *Selections from the Duncan Records*, vol. i. p. 153. Benares, 1873.

[4] *Idem*, pp. 153, 154.

that the Muhammadan law discriminated in favour of the Musalman tenant as against the Hindu. Thus the farmán of Aurangzeb in 1668 directed that in reclaimed lands the True Believer was to pay one-tenth, and the Infidel the full customary rate, estimated at one-half the produce.

Dismissing such privileged classes of tenants, privileged whether for considerations of birth or of social position, or for services rendered, or for religious or educational purposes, the Bengal cultivators arranged themselves for the most part in two categories: the main body of Resident Cultivators in the village, and a smaller body of Non-resident or Temporary Tenants. The Resident Cultivators, by whatever term they be called,[1] were the hereditary body of cultivators formed the village community, and tilled the village lands. The best, or at any rate the most authoritative, description of them at the period dealt with in these volumes is that by John Shore in 1789. He describes them as cultivators who 'by long occupancy acquire a right of possession in the soil, and are not subject to be removed; but this right does not authorise them to sell or mortgage it, and it is so far distinct from a right of property.'[2] 'It is equally understood as a prescriptive law, that the ráiyats who hold by this tenure cannot relinquish any part of the lands in their possession, or change the species of cultivation without a forfeiture of their right of occupancy, which is rarely insisted upon,

[1] Their most general names were *Khúd-Kásht*, defined by H. H. Wilson as 'a cultivator of his own hereditary land,' and *Thání*, 'stationary, resident,' 'a resident cultivator, one who has a proprietary interest in the soil.'—Wilson's *Glossary*, pp. 287 and 518, ed. 1845.

[2] John Shore's Minute of 18th June 1789, para. 389. Madras Reprint of 1866, p. 163.

and the zamíndárs demand and exact the difference. I understood also that this right of occupancy is admitted to extend even to the heirs of those who enjoy it.'[1]

The right of the Resident Cultivator to cultivate his lands, carried, therefore, the obligation to cultivate them. This obligation had, in the second half of the last century, a serious meaning. For the devastations of the Maráthás, down to the time when the East India Company established order in Lower Bengal, and the great famine of 1769–70, which swept away one-third of its remaining inhabitants, had reduced the population to much below the strength required for the cultivation of the village lands. In 1772, the Governor-General in Council reported the loss as 'at least one-third of the inhabitants of the province.'[2] To take an individual zamíndárí, the revenue accounts of Bírbhúm District returned more than one-third of the cultivable land as 'deserted'[3] in 1771. In 1776 the entries in this column exceeded one-half the whole tillage, four acres lying waste for every seven that remained under cultivation.[4] It was with truth that Philip Francis wrote in the latter year: 'In the present state of the country the ráiyat has the advantage over the zamíndár. Where so much land lies waste, and so few hands are left for cultivation, the peasant must be courted to undertake it.'[5]

The allurement by which the zamíndárs 'courted' 'the peasant,' was to offer land on lower terms to

[1] *Idem*, para. 406, p. 164.

[2] Letter to the Court of Directors, dated 3rd Nov. 1772; quoted *in extenso* in my *Annals of Rural Bengal*, Appendix A, p. 381, 5th edition.

[3] 'Palátika,' Hast-o-búd Accounts (MS.), for the Bengali year 1178.

[4] Hast-o-búd Accounts for Bírbhúm for the Bengali year 1183, in the MS. District Records.

[5] Minute by Mr. Francis: 'Revenue Consultations' of 5th Nov. 1776.

strangers than the established rates levied from the Resident Cultivators of the village. The Resident Cultivators had two rights and two correlative obligations. They had a right to, and they were obliged to, till their hereditary holdings; they had a right to, and they were obliged to, pay for those holdings at the customary rates. In thickly-peopled provinces, or wherever there were more cultivators than there was land for them to till, the customary rates paid by the Resident Cultivators were lower than the rates at which an outsider could obtain a holding. In thinly-peopled districts, or wherever there was more land than there were cultivators to till it, an outside cultivator could obtain a holding at a lower rate than the customary rates paid by the Resident Cultivators. In the former case the rights of the Resident Cultivator out-valued the obligations attached to them; in the latter case the obligations were, from a monetary point of view, more onerous than the rights were worth. In both cases the position of the Resident Cultivator appeared to be regulated by custom. But, in both, his actual position was dominated by the economic law of supply and demand.

Under the Muhammadan system to which we succeeded, effective machinery existed for enforcing the obligations of the Resident Cultivators. The revenue instructions of Aurangzeb in 1668 represent the final Imperial development of that system. Although directed by name to the Civil Governor of Gujarát,[1] they were

[1] John Shore refers to them as inserted in the *Mirát Ahmadi*, a Persian History of Gujarát, and as addressed to the Diwán of that province. They commence merely with the words: 'To the trusty Muhammad Hashím, whose hope is in the Royal favour, be it known,' etc. After some pious expressions, their general application is ordered.—Rouse's *Dissertation*, Appendix ix. pp. 300–314.

issued to the revenue agents 'now in office, as well as those who may be hereafter employed in the affairs of the protected dominions of Hindustan, from one extremity to the other.' They form a sort of Revenue Code in eighteen sections, and their English translation extends over fifteen pages. The Emperor commands the revenue officers, that 'from the commencement of the year' (*i.e.* each agricultural year) 'they shall, as far as they are able, acquire information of the circumstances of every husbandman, whether they (*sic*) are employed in cultivation or have neglected it.' The industrious cultivators are to be treated with indulgence. But those who, with the means at their disposal, 'have neglected to cultivate their lands, they shall admonish and threaten, and use force and stripes.'[1]

In Lower Bengal, not only had the ẓamíndárs and revenue farmers the right to compel the Resident Cultivators to till their lands, a right which they enforced by dragging them to their private land-courts, confining them, quartering armed men on recalcitrant villages, and levying the rent of the 'absconded' cultivators from the general body of Resident Husbandmen who remained. They had also the right, when a Resident Cultivator deserted his fields, to pursue him to his new place of abode, and to call on the Government authorities to compel him to return to his native village. Such cases of 'absconded ráiyats' form an important feature in the administrative history of many Bengal Districts during the twenty years preceding the Permanent Settlement,[2] and occupy many letters to and

[1] For translation *in extenso*, see Rouse's *Dissertation*, p. 303.

[2] See, for example, my *Annals of Rural Bengal*, Bírbhúm District, pp. 60, 61, 5th edition.

from the Board of Revenue. To confine our attention to the *zamíndárí* singled out for special reference in the last chapter, the opening year (1782) of Volume I. discloses some of the Bishnupur cultivators fled into the adjoining zamíndárí of Bardwán, and the authorities in Bardwán are to be called on to hand over the Bishnupur cultivators 'who may have taken refuge there.'[1]

Once the system of 'absconding' into other estates or fiscal divisions gained ground among the Resident Cultivators, it tended to spread rapidly. For, as I have indicated, the Resident Cultivators were jointly and severally responsible for the whole revenue from the lands of the village commune, and those who remained were therefore liable for the rents of those who deserted their holdings. Under the Muhammadans this joint responsibility had formed a regular part of the village revenue system, and was enforced by an extra cess called *Nájáí*. The term is described by Horace Hayman Wilson as 'a tax formerly assessed in Bengal upon the cultivators present, to make up for any deficiency arising from the death or disappearance of their neighbours.'[2] When, therefore, a part of the Resident Cultivators absconded, those who remained were tempted to follow their example, rather than stay behind and pay up the rents of the absentees in addition to their own.

The Muhammadan system provided, however, not only for the enforcement of the Resident Cultivator's obligations, but also for the maintenance of his rights. His rights, as we have seen, were to dwell in his hereditary homestead and to cultivate his hereditary

[1] Letters Nos. 83 and 96, Vol. I.

[2] H. H. Wilson's *Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms*, p. 363, Quarto ed. 1855.

holding, on the terms established by custom in the fiscal division or *pargana* within which his village lay. These terms are comprehensively and constantly referred to in the early records as 'the *parganá* rates.'[1] In every fiscal division there was a prescriptive rent charged on each of the different classes of lands, regulated by the value of the crops grown upon it. How the *parganá* rates were originally arrived at, is a matter of research which does not immediately concern us here. Theoretically, they represented the division of the crop between the State and the cultivator. Practically, they amounted to a customary rent which allowed not only for the share claimed by the State, but also, in most districts of Lower Bengal, for an intermediate income to the zamíndárs.

The validity of the rent rates thus established by custom was always present in the minds of the framers of the Permanent Settlement. 'Whoever cultivates the land,' wrote Lord Cornwallis,[2] perhaps generalising unduly from the status of the Resident Cultivators, 'the zamíndárs can receive no more than the established rent, which in most cases is fully equal to what the cultivator can afford to pay.' The Permanent Settlement endeavoured, unsuccessfully as we shall see, to substitute a system of leases for this system of customary rates. But it carefully provided that wherever leases had not been adopted, 'the established rates and usages of the *parganá*' were to be taken as the legal rent.

What were these *parganá rates?* They were made up, at the period with which we deal, of two constituent

[1] *Parganát-i-nirkh*, or popularly 'the Nirkbundy.'

[2] Minute of 3rd Feb. 1790, Fifth Report, Appendix V. p. 615. Madras Reprint, 1866.

parts: a fixed rate per acre (*asal-jamá*), and a variety of *abwábs* or cesses added to that rate. The average rate was defined, the cesses were indefinite. John Shore thus described the practical result in his Minute of the 18th June 1789.[1] 'In every District throughout Bengal, where the licence of exaction has not superseded all rule, the rents of the land are regulated by known rates, called *Nirkh*, and in some Districts each village has its own. These rates are formed, with respect to the produce of the land, at so much per *bígah*. Some soil produces two crops in a year of different species, some three. The more profitable articles, such as the mulberry plant, betel leaf, tobacco, sugar-cane, and others, render the value of the land proportionably great. These rates must have been fixed upon by a measurement of the land, and the settlement of Todar Mall may have furnished the basis of them.[2] In the course of time, cesses were superadded to the standard, and became included in a subsequent valuation, the rates varying with every succeeding measurement.[3] At present there are many *abwábs* or cesses collected distinct from the *Nirkh*' (or recognised lawful demand) 'and not included in it, although they are levied in certain proportions to it.'

Elsewhere Sir John Shore explains how most of these cesses were defrayed not out of the zamíndárs' profits, but were exacted *pro rata* from the cultivators. Colonel Sykes declared that, taken as a whole, the cesses

[1] Para. 391, 392, Fifth Report, Appendix, p. 162. Madras Reprint, 1866.

[2] John Shore was not at that time aware of the imperfect character of Akbar's land settlement in Lower Bengal.

[3] In assuming the existence of successive measurements, John Shore went beyond the ascertained facts.

'rendered nugatory the permanent land tax,' or established average rate in the Deccan. Warren Hastings, as early as 1776, pointed out that the Resident Cultivators in Lower Bengal were practically at the mercy of the zamíndárs, as they naturally clung to their own village, 'where they have built themselves substantial houses, or derived them by inheritance from their fathers. These men will suffer much before they abandon their habitations, and therefore they are made to suffer much.'[1]

The rights and the obligations of the Resident Cultivators were maintained by a system of village and *parganá* registrars. The village register in Lower Bengal was kept up by a village officer, generally known as the *Patwárí*,[2] who derived his emoluments from allowances paid by the cultivators,[3] and from a small grant of the village lands. It was the village registrar's duty to keep up, and to produce to the revenue officers when required, an account of the village lands, cultivated and uncultivated; of the holdings of the separate cultivators, and of the established rates at which the various classes of land were held. Under the native system he was regarded as the representative of the body of village cultivators in their dealings with the revenue agents and zamíndárs. The State agency of record was in its turn represented by the kánúngos, a chain of officials

[1] Minute by the Governor-General, 12th Nov. 1776.

[2] The Village Accountant, under one name or another, formed an essential and almost universal feature of the Indian commune.

[3] Stated by the *Aín-i-Akbarí* to have originally been 2 p. c. 'to be divided equally between the patwárí and kánúngo.' But the revenue regulations of Northern India in the sixteenth century cannot be strictly predicated of Lower Bengal at the end of the eighteenth. I describe the system as actually existing at the latter period.

which extended from the *Sadr Kánúngo*, or chief registrar at the seat of the Government, to the *Parganá Kánúngos*, or registrars of fiscal divisions. The kánúngos were remunerated by a small percentage on the revenue collected, and they were liable to a fee or succession-duty on obtaining or succeeding to their office.[1] Like the zamíndárs and other revenue agents, their position as officials paid by Government, whether by a percentage or by a salary, is clearly stated in the *Aín-í-Akbarí*.[2] When the office of kánúngo was abolished, as part of the changes embodied in the Permanent Settlement, the allowances of the kánúngos and their claims for compensation formed a subject of much correspondence.[3]

That correspondence discloses the various links in the official chain; with the *Sadr Kánúngo* or chief registrar at the head, through the *Naibs* or deputy kánúngos, down to the kánúngos of *parganás* or registrars of fiscal divisions at the other end. The chief registrar of Bengal was a high officer of wealth and great power. Under the Muhammadan system, he was appointed by the Emperor, and formed the Imperial check on the Governor of the Province.[4] Under the Company's administration, before the Permanent Settlement, we have seen the Chief Kánúngo act as security for the revenue of a principality like Bishnupur (p. 40). The kánúngos of fiscal divisions[5] at the lower extremity,

[1] Letter No. 1225, Vol. I.

[2] Gladwin's Translation, 287. Ed. 1800.

[3] For example, Letters Nos. 7213, 9214, 9221, 10,806, 11,931, etc.

[4] See the relations of Dherp Nárain and Murshid Kúlí Khán, Stewart's *History of Bengal*, p. 234. Calcutta edition, 1847.

[5] A detailed description of the duties of the local kánúngos, at the period of which I treat, is given in the Report of the Collector of Bhágalpur, dated

were petty revenue officers in direct contact with the village registrars or *patwárís*, who represented the cultivators. 'The *patwárí*,' says the *Aín-í-Akbarí*, 'is employed on the part of the husbandman to keep an account of his receipts and disbursements; and no village is without one of these.' In another passage, the *patwárís* and clerks are 'to keep their respective accounts of the produce of the soil.'[1] From this point of view the *patwárí* was regarded as a revenue official, and in some points he acted conjointly with the elected or hereditary village head.[2] The *parganá* kánúngo, or registrar of the fiscal division, had the double duty of making up the Government demand from these accounts of the *patwárís*, or village registrars, and of seeing that the revenue farmers or zamíndárs did not exceed that demand. In this latter capacity, the *Aín-í-Akbarí* states that 'the kánúngo is the protector of the husbandman; and there is one in every *parganá*.' Their accounts formed the practical basis of the revenue collections,[3] from the Settlement of Akbar in the third quarter of the sixteenth century,[4] down to the Settlement

6th Dec. 1787, reproduced *in extenso* in the Fifth Report, 1866. Madras Reprint, pp. 219–221. The subject is frequently referred to in the present four volumes: *e.g.* Letter No. 1313, p. 144 of Vol. I., and many others under the heading KÁNÚNGOS in Index to Vol. IV.

[1] *Aín-í-Akbarí*, Gladwin's Translation, or rather paraphrase, vol. i. pp. 306 and 287. Ed. 1800.

[2] Minute by the Governor-General (Warren Hastings) of the 4th July 1786, on the Village Heads, or Mandals, of Lower Bengal. See also John Shore's Minute of 18th June 1789, sections 242–245. Madras Reprint.

[3] Minute by John Shore, dated 18th June 1789, sections 249, 250, Fifth Report. Madras Reprint, 1866. See also section 399.

[4] Akbar's Settlement was effected by a Commission of ten imperial kánúngos 'to collect the accounts of the provincial kánúngos.'—*Aín-í-Akbarí*, Gladwin's Translation, 293. Ed. 1800.

of Lord Cornwallis in the third quarter of the eighteenth.

The Resident Cultivators held their lands, therefore, under a very complete system of record—a record formed and kept up by their own representative, the village registrar (*patwárí*), and checked and formulated as the lawful demand from the village by the official registrar of the fiscal division (*parganá kánúngo*). But, unfortunately, before the Company acquired the Diwání grant of Bengal, the original demand had been so raised by cesses or *abwábs*, as to render the rights of the Resident Cultivators 'nugatory.'[1] The village register had become a record of obligations rather than of rights.[2] Yet they clung to their family homesteads; and, to repeat the words of Warren Hastings in 1776: 'These men will suffer much before they abandon their habitations, and therefore they are made to suffer much.' Their attachment to their hereditary holdings was not, however, a purely sentimental one.

In the first place, the Resident Cultivators formed the governing body of the village commune, its *bhadra log* or respectable class. As such they had not only a good social standing, and a power of borrowing from the village money-lender, but also a number of communal privileges in regard to their homestead plots, and to the

[1] The same condition of things existed in the North-Western Provinces, as proved by the *Duncan Records*, and in Southern India, as testified by Colonel Sykes and others. So far as a generalisation is possible, it was truly stated that the native system of *abwábs* had left only a 'bare living' to the tillers of the soil.

[2] To take a single example. The demands on a ráiyat in 1781 consisted of Rs. 14 for *asal-jamá*, or fixed demand, and nearly Rs. 11 for cesses; total just under Rs. 25. Additional cesses had afterwards been imposed.—Shore's Minute of 18th June 1789, para. 393.

pasture and forest lands, to the water reservoirs and fisheries, to the services of the village servants or officials, and to the pick of the fields left unoccupied. In the second place, they held as a rule more land than they were assessed for in the village register. In some Districts this custom was so well acknowledged, that even when leases were adopted the transaction proceeded on the understanding that the cultivator held three times as much land as he paid for.[1] The customary burdens of the cultivators were alleviated by customary frauds. 'Custom,' wrote Warren Hastings, speaking with the ripened experience of his long Governor-Generalship,—'Custom is a law whose obligation operates in their own defence.'[2] The result of this was a perpetual conflict of two forces, the force of oppression and the force of evasion, 'exhibiting,' in the words of John Shore, 'an intricate scene of collusion opposed to exaction, and of unlicensed demand substituted for methodised claims.'[3]

The truth is that the Mughal revenue system had broken down in the eighteenth century, as the Mughal political system had broken down. The *Duncan Records* for the Benares Province in the North-West, 1787–1795, tell the same mournful story as the records of the Calcutta Board of Revenue for the same period. The cultivators had been reduced to abject poverty by cesses or *abwábs*. 'Thus the bow was strained till at

[1] In Jessore District, Harrington mentions that the nominal rate was Rs. 3 per *bígha*, but the actual rate only 1 rupee, 'as the ráiyats possess fifteen *bíghas* when their *pattas* state five only, and upon the last quantity the assessment of 3 rupees is made.'—Harrington's Analysis, quoted *Zemíndary Settlement of Bengal*, vol. i. Appendix V. p. 103.

[2] Minute by the Governor-General, Bengal Revenue Consultations, of the 4th July 1786.

[3] Minute of the 8th Dec. 1789, para. 10, Fifth Report. Madras Reprint.

length it snapped.'[1] Many fiscal divisions of the Benares Province were found in a state of decay, and some even 'of the largest and best of them little better than a waste.' In Lower Bengal economic laws came to the relief of the Resident Cultivators. The old sharp cauteries of population, the sword and famine, strengthened the position of those who were left. We have seen that the devastations of the Maráthás, almost down to the time that the Company established its power in 1757, and the great famine of 1769–70, shortly after it received the Diwání grant from the Emperor in 1765, left one-third of Bengal bare of inhabitants. Custom has in the long-run to readjust itself to the economic facts; and the fact that the Resident Cultivators had only to migrate a few miles to get land at half-price set practical limits to exactions, however well sanctioned by custom, in their own villages. Since the famine of 1770, the customary rates for land in Lower Bengal were in excess of the economic rent which could be obtained for it. Those of the Resident Cultivators who had most courage, or least fixed property to leave behind, refused to pay the customary rates, quitted their hereditary holdings, and took up land at the market rent as Non-resident or Temporary Tenants in some other village.

These were the 'vagrant ráiyats' who formed the chief obstacle in the way of the zamíndárs realising the settled revenue demand for the Government, and whom the records disclose as being followed up, and, whenever possible, forced to return to their ancestral villages.

[1] *Selections from the Duncan Records*, p. 31. Benares, 1873. See Letters given under heading BENARES in Index to my Vol. IV. With reference to a single series of depredations in Benares, see Letters Nos. 6205, 6208–9, 6223, 6256, Vol. II.

They could not always be compelled to do so. For the zamíndár on whose land they settled found them an additional source of income, and protected them from pursuit and recapture. They grew rapidly in numbers after the famine of 1769–70, and their position is set forth both by Philip Francis and Warren Hastings in the Bengal Revenue Consultations of 1776. Warren Hastings described them thus: 'The vagrant ráiyats (as Mr. Francis observes) have it in their power, in some measure, to make their own terms with the zamíndárs. They take land at an under-rent, [and] hold it for one season. The zamíndár then increases their rent, or exacts more from them than their agreement, and the ráiyats either desert, or if they continue, they hold their land at a lower rent than the established rate of the country. Thus the ancient and industrious tenants are obliged to submit to undue exactions,[1] while the vagrant ráiyats enjoy land at half-price, which operates as an encouragement to desertion, and to the depopulation of the country.'[2]

An instructive example of how quickly old custom even in India has to readjust itself to new economic conditions, is afforded by the fact that the 'vagrant ráiyats,' thus animadverted on in 1776, had within ten years acquired a recognised position in the Bengal village system. It is also an example of how readily an established status may be acquired in rural India, and how

[1] As they were liable for the total demand from the villages, and had theoretically to make good the rent of the Resident Cultivators who had deserted their holdings. *Vide ante*, p. 54.

[2] Governor-General's Minute of 12th Nov. 1776. This and the other Minutes in Council of the same date occupy ten folio pages in the *Selection of Papers from the Records at the East India House*, vol. i. pp. 441–452. London 1820.

custom is forced to give its sanction to existing facts. By 1787 the 'vagrant ráiyats' had legitimatised their position, and were an acknowledged section of the cultivating body, with definite rights of their own. Those rights were to hold their lands either under leases from the zamíndárs, or as tenants-at-will on the lowest terms at which they could effect and maintain a footing in the village. The *per contra* attached to these rights was the liability to have their rent raised to the established *parganá* rates, on the expiry of their leases, or, in the case of those who held no leases, when the increasing population enabled the zamíndár to enforce those rates from them.

They effected their footing in two ways: either in villages completely abandoned; or in villages in which a certain proportion of the holdings had been thrown up. In the former case their position was a strong one. For they were welcomed as reclaimers of the deserted lands, were practically the re-founders of a new village commune, and frequently succeeded in establishing new customary rates at a much lower standard than the old one. When they settled in villages only partially abandoned, their position was much weaker. For the rates payable by, and still nominally levied from, the body of the Resident Cultivators continued to be the 'established customary rates,' and to those rates the newcomers were liable as soon as the increased demand for land should enable the zamíndár to exact them. Both forms of settlement were common. To take the example of the District of Bírbhúm already cited, not only had fifteen hundred village communes been destroyed by the famine of 1769–70,[1] but even in the larger urban ones which

[1] Hast-o-búd Accounts for the Bengal year 1178 (A.D. 1771), quoted *ante*, p. 51.

survived, three-fourths of the houses or homesteads were left uninhabited.[1]

The inquiries instituted by Lord Cornwallis in 1787, with a view to the protection of the cultivators,[2] disclosed, therefore, three facts. *First*, That the Muhammadan revenue system of a fixed rate,[3] varied and increased by cesses,[4] the system which the Company was appointed to administer by the Imperial grant of 1765, had broken down, and no longer afforded protection to the cultivators. Its break-down had been due partly to the accumulated weight of its own exactions, and partly to the altered economic relations of land to labour, resulting from the depletion of the population by the famine of 1769–70. *Second*, That the record of customary rates had ceased to be a protection to the Resident Cultivators, and that the village registers had become to them a record of crushing obligations rather than a record of rights. *Third*, That the people had themselves made a movement to readjust rents to the altered economic conditions, by developing[5] a body of Non-resident Cultivators or Temporary Tenants, whose presence in almost every village tended to reduce customary rates to the standard of supply and demand, and whose status had by 1787 legitimatised itself.

Lord Cornwallis and his colleagues were of one mind as to the principles, and up to a certain point were unanimous as to the methods, by which to deal with this difficult state of things. They were all agreed that the pledges of their predecessors from 1759[6] onwards, as to the protection of cultivators, must be upheld. They were

[1] Report of the Supervisor, Mr. Higginson, dated 22nd February 1771.
[2] Letter No. 1307, Vol. I.
[3] *Asal-jamá.* [4] *Abwáb.*
[5] I say 'developing,' as this class had always existed.
[6] *Vide ante*, pp. 47, 48.

agreed that, as the Government was now about to limit its revenue demand upon the zamíndárs for a term of years, or for ever, so it ought to limit for the same term, or for ever, the rent demand of the zamíndárs upon the Resident tillers of the soil.

So far for the principles. In regard to the methods for giving effect to these principles, a divergence of opinion arose. As to the first point mentioned on p. 65, the break-down of the native system under the accumulated weight of cesses (*abwábs*), it was agreed that, as the Government was to give up its right to add any further cesses to its revenue demand from the zamíndárs, it was entitled to prohibit the zamíndárs from adding any further cess to their rent demand from the Resident Cultivators. This it did, under a severe penalty upon the zamíndárs, of threefold the amount of any cess illegally exacted.

As regards the second point, the failure of the village registers to afford a real protection to the Resident Cultivators, the framers of the Permanent Settlement determined to establish a system of written declarations of right for each individual holding. These written declarations of right were called *pattas*, or corruptly *pottahs*, a word usually rendered by 'lease,' as the single English term which comes nearest to its meaning. But the Bengal 'lease' or *patta* was not a covenant between the landholder and the tenant for the leasing of a certain amount of land. It was both in form and substance a declaration or acknowledgment on the part of the zamíndár, that the cultivator held certain lands at certain rates; and it was accompanied by a counter-agreement, *Kabúliyat*, literally 'consent,' on the part of the cultivator, acknowledging that he held the said lands at the said rates, and admitting his responsibility for the same.

While, therefore, I shall employ the English term 'lease' as the nearest synonym to the Bengali word *patta*, it must be clearly understood that I use it in the Bengal sense of a declaratory instrument setting forth the cultivator's holding, and not in the English sense of a contract originating the right of the cultivator to his holding. The framers of the Permanent Settlement sought to free the cultivator from the accumulated growth of rates and cesses in the village register: a growth of claims so 'numerous, arbitrary, and indefinite,'[1] that neither the cultivators nor the revenue officers could be sure of the total. The result was the annual 'intricate scene of collusion opposed to exaction,' which I have already described in John Shore's words. Lord Cornwallis and John Shore tried to accomplish their benevolent object by giving each cultivator a statutory right to a Bengali lease or declaration of his holding, stating the quantity of land which he held, and the sum which under the established rates he was liable to pay. They did not intend to abolish the established rates, but to perpetuate and define them by *pattas*. Nor did they foresee that the change would tend to substitute a system of land cultivation by contract, for the old record of rights kept up by the *patwárís* or village registrars.

In thus endeavouring to create a universal system of declaratory leases for the protection of the husbandmen, Lord Cornwallis and his advisers merely carried out the policy bequeathed to them by their predecessors. Ever since the Company acquired the grant of Bengal, it sought to 'encourage the raíyats' by means of *pattas* which should define and limit the zamíndárs' claims. This policy was clearly asserted as a preliminary to the

[1] John Shore's Minute of 8th December 1789.

Company's first attempt at rural administration by means of Supervisors in 1769.[1] It was exhaustively discussed in 1776, when the land was about to come more directly under British management on the expiry of the Five Years' Settlement (1772–1777); and it formed one of the few points on which Philip Francis and Warren Hastings agreed. Warren Hastings desired to secure the cultivators by declaratory leases based on the existing engagements, and 'the *nirkh-bundy* or rates of land by which they are regulated in each District.'[2] Francis, despairing of the success of the intricate and wide-spread inquiries which would be involved, preferred the short-cut of 'a fixed *jamá*,' or rental, alike for the zamíndár and the cultivator.[3] But whatever their differences as to the method, they were of one mind as to the protection of the cultivators by means of declaratory leases, *pattas*.

This was the policy to which Lord Cornwallis fell heir, and which he tried to carry into execution. He and John Shore saw that one weak point in all previous attempts to introduce declaratory leases had been the indefinite character of the declaration. 'The *patta* rarely expresses the sum-total of the rents, and it is difficult to determine what is extortion.'[4] But at this

[1] 'For the ráiyat, being eased and secured from all burthens and demands but what are imposed by the legal authority of Government itself, and future *pattas* being granted him specifying that demand, he should be taught that he is to regard the same as a sacred and inviolable pledge to him, [and] that he is liable to no further demands beyond their amount.'—*Proceedings of President and Select Committee*, 16th August 1769.

[2] Governor-General's Minute of the 1st Nov. 1776; *Selections from the Records at the East India House*, vol. i. p. 436. 1820.

[3] Mr. Francis' Minute of the 5th Nov. 1766, *idem*, pp. 437–441.

[4] Minute by John Shore, 8th Dec. 1789, para. 16, Fifth Report, vol. i. p. 602. Madras Reprint, 1866.

point a divergence of view arose in 1789 between the English statesman Cornwallis and the experienced Indian administrator Shore, somewhat similar to that between Philip Francis and Warren Hastings in 1776. John Shore held, as Hastings had held, that a comprehensive and minute investigation was an absolutely essential preliminary. He proposed to make the zamíndárs responsible for carrying out the inquiry. 'They shall begin,' he says, in his *Permanent Plan for the Ease and Security of the Ráiyats*, 1789,[1] 'with those *parganás* (or fiscal divisions) where the impositions are most numerous, and having obtained an account of them, shall, in concert with the ráiyats, consolidate the whole, as far as possible, into one specific sum; but so that in no case the sums demanded from the ráiyats shall exceed three articles, viz. *asal*,[2] *abwáb*,[3] and *karcha*.[4] Having prepared this account, they shall submit it to the Collector for his inspection, after which it is to be enforced by the authority of Government; and any enhancement of the *abwáb* or *karcha* to be punished as extortion.

'That where, by mutual consent of the ráiyats and the zamíndárs, the *abwáb* can be wholly reduced and consolidated, it be done accordingly; and the rates of the land, according to the nature of the soil and the produce, to be the rule for fixing the rent.

'That the rents of each *parganá* in the zamíndárí be annually adjusted in the same manner, until the whole be completed; and that the exact proportion which the *abwáb* and *karcha* bears to the *asal jamá* be precisely

[1] Minute of 18th June 1789, Fifth Report. Madras Reprint, vol. i. pp. 209, 210.

[2] Fixed demand for the holding.

[3] The customary cesses added thereto.

[4] Customary allowance for the zamíndár's expenses.

determined. The zamíndár is to be positively enjoined to regulate a certain proportion of his zamíndárí annually, so that the whole be completely performed within years (*sic*) from the date of his agreement.'

John Shore provided alike for the protection of the Resident Cultivators by an ordinary *patta*, or declaratory lease, and for the protection of the Temporary Tenants who hired land by a hiring or contract lease, known as a *thika patta*.[1] He also allowed for cases in which a general arrangement[2] had been made with tenants, and recorded in the village registers, and for cases in which rent was paid in kind. In every case the amount of the rent was to be specifically stated, and the zamíndár was bound, under penalty of fine, to publicly record the established rates of rent[3] for the various classes of land.[4]

Lord Cornwallis recognised the value of such an inquiry, but he shrank from the delay which it would have involved. He argued as follows: 'Mr. Shore's proposition that the rents of the ráiyats, by whatever rule or custom they may be demanded, shall be specific as to their amount; that the landholders shall be obliged, within a certain time, to grant *pattas* or writings to their ráiyats, in which this amount shall be inserted; and that no ráiyat shall be liable to pay more than the sum actually specified in his *patta*—if duly enforced by the Collectors—will soon obviate the objection to a fixed assessment, founded upon the undefined state of the demands of the landholders upon the ráiyats.'[5] Again,

[1] Or, less correctly spelt, *ticca pottah*, from *thika*, meaning hire, fixed price, or a contract rate. [2] *Jamá-bandí*. [3] *Nirkh-bandí*.

[4] Minute of 18th June 1789, Annexure I., para. 27.

[5] Governor-General's Minute of 3rd Feb. 1790, given *in extenso*, Fifth Report, vol. i. Appendix v. pp. 609-626. Madras Reprint, 1866, p. 614.

'Whoever becomes a proprietor of land after these *pattas* have been issued, will succeed to the tenure under the condition, and with the knowledge, that these *pattas* are to be the rules by which the rents are to be collected from the ráyats.'[1]

Lord Cornwallis gave the sanction of his executive Government to John Shore's proposal for an exhaustive inquiry into the exact sum to be paid by each cultivator. He gave a legislative right to each cultivator to demand a declaratory lease, or *patta*, specifying the rent. 'The rents to be paid by the ráiyats, by whatever rule or custom they may be regulated, shall be specially stated in the *patta*, which in every possible case shall contain the exact sum to be paid by them.'[2] But Lord Cornwallis, while making a declaratory lease to the cultivator a fundamental part of the Permanent Settlement, declined to delay that Settlement until local inquiry should have disclosed 'the exact sum' thus referred to. Lord Cornwallis believed that he was giving the cultivator the same right to hold his fields for ever at a fixed rent as he was giving to the zamíndár to hold his estate for ever at a fixed land tax. He was mistaken. 'The exact sum' to be paid by the landholder to the Government was specified at the time of the Settlement. 'The exact sum' to be paid by the cultivator to the landholder was left to be defined by local inquiries, which were never carrried to completion.

I have mentioned that unforeseen circumstances intervened between Lord Cornwallis' benevolent intentions to the zamíndárs and the actual results. I shall also show how unforeseen circumstances intervened between Lord Cornwallis' benevolent intentions to the

[1] *Idem*, p. 616. [2] Regulation VIII. of 1793, clause lvii. sub-section (1).

cultivators and the actual results. But in both cases Lord Cornwallis honestly endeavoured to carry out the policy prescribed by the Court of Directors and by Parliament, in accordance with 'the law and constitution of India,' and upon the lines deliberately adopted by his predecessors after a long period of inquiry and experiment. He tried to consolidate the various classes of zamíndárs into a strong proprietary body, by amalgamating their status by custom and their status by official grant or *sanad* into a uniform statutory title. He tried to consolidate the claims of the various classes of cultivators into a permanent tenant-right, by protecting them from any further cesses, and by giving to all a legal title to a declaratory lease based on 'the established rates.' At the same time he freed them from the joint responsibility for making good the rents of Resident Cultivators who had deserted their fields.

We shall see how partial was his success. But there is as little truth in Mill's statement that 'the ráiyats were, therefore, handed over to the zamíndárs in gross,'[1] as in his summing up of the principles which determined the Permanent Settlement with the landholders: 'The legislators were English aristocrats, and aristocratical prejudices prevailed.'[2] The original District records which I now place for the first time before the public were not available as a whole to Mr. Mill. For Mill never thought of penetrating deeper than the correspondence which reached the India House in London. He never set foot on Indian soil; he knew not a single one of the Indian languages; nor had he any acquaintance with the provincial and rural records, which exhibit the facts as

[1] *The History of British India*, by James Mill, vol. v. p. 486. H. H. Wilson's ed. 1840.

[2] *Idem*, vol. v. p. 492.

collected by unprejudiced inquirers on the spot and at the time. But, after making every such allowance, it is difficult to acquit Mr. Mill of twisting the evidence actually before him, in order to support his preconceived theories, and to suit his political views.

# CHAPTER IV.

## REASONS FOR DECLARING THE SETTLEMENT PERMANENT.

I HAVE shown that the Muhammadan land system had broken down as regards the protection of the cultivators. It had also broken down as regards the rental of the landholders and the revenue of the State. During the three last years of the native administration, preceding the Imperial grant of Bengal to the Company in 1765, the land revenue demand aggregated £5,952,135, of which only £2,225,013 were realised, leaving a balance of £3,727,122.[1]

The Company inherited, and at first continued, the old harsh method of enforcing the land tax from the revenue farmers, 'by the punishments usual in zamíndarís, of imprisonment and confiscation of the effects both of themselves and their securities; or if these means prove ineffectual, and it should appear it will answer the end intended, by punishing the principals with stripes.'[2] Corporal chastisement was a recognised method of

[1] Revenue Statement for the 'Diwání lands' during the Bengal years 1169, 1170, 1171 (1762-63 to 1764-65 A.D.) Fifth Report, p. 113. Madras Reprint, 1866. The dangers which beset any attempt to use the old revenue returns for comparative purposes will be explained at pp. 105-107.

[2] Bengal Proceedings of January 26th and April 2nd, 1764. Nos. 753 and 758, Long's *Selections of Unpublished Records*. Government Press, Calcutta, 1869.

realising the land tax alike in the imperial regulations of Aurangzeb,[1] and in the practice of the local Muhammadan Courts from Bengal[2] in the north to the southern extremity of India.[3]

When in 1765 the Company became responsible for the administration of Bengal, it shrank from the use of the lash. But, finding the landholders unable to pay the old rates, it adopted in a milder form the system of the Muhammadan Viceroy at the beginning of the century, who 'entirely dispossessed the zamíndárs of all interference in the collection,'[4] and farmed out the land tax to the highest bidders. Even this vigorous measure failed to extract the expected amount, and the system of auction leases for five years from 1772 to 1777 yielded little better results. The remissions and irrecoverable balances on the five years' leases exceeded two and a half millions sterling.[5] Indeed, John Shore stated that 'the Settlement of 1772, before the expiration of the leases, existed, he believed, nowhere upon its original terms.'

The old system had broken down even more signally in regard to the landholders. The printed proceedings before 1782 disclose most of the great landed houses of Bengal in pecuniary distress; and the manuscript correspondence of the Board of Revenue from 1782 onwards, summarised in my present four volumes,

[1] *Vide ante*, p. 53.

[2] Stewart's *History of Bengal*, p. 237. Calcutta, ed. 1847.

[3] *Haidar Alí and Tipú Sultán*, by Lewis Bowring, C.S.I., formerly Chief Commissioner of Mysore, p. 78. Ed. 1893.

[4] Stewart's *History of Bengal*, p. 232. Calcutta, ed. 1847.

[5] Rs. 24,806,486, then equivalent to over £2,500,000. Statement of the Accountant-General, dated 12th July 1777, quoted by Mill, vol. iv. p. 13. Ed. 1840.

forms during many years a mere record of their ruin. The Letters cited below[1] are only a few out of hundreds, and the reader can follow the mournful story for himself in the Index to Volume IV., or in the *Annals of Rural Bengal*.[2] 'Their case,' wrote John Shore of the more impecunious zamíndárs in 1789,—'their case, as described, is desperate under any plan.'[3]

The Muhammadan system of land administration, to which the East India Company fell heir in 1765, had broken down alike in regard to the State, the landholders, and the cultivators; partly from economic causes, and partly because the British administrators revolted from the severities which the Muhammadan Government employed. How to deal with 'absconded proprietors' was one of many difficult problems of the day.[4] For all those problems, Lord Cornwallis and his advisers proposed a uniform solution: fixity of tenure and a statutory title. They differed, as I have shown, in their methods for working out the remedies. Shore, with the caution of an experienced Indian administrator, wished to put these remedies to the test of a ten years' trial, before he committed the Government irretrievably to their adoption. Lord Cornwallis believed that the time for experiment had gone by, and that, if the tentative efforts at administration of the past quarter of a century had not provided a basis for definite action, there was but slight hope of increased knowledge from further delay.

[1] Letters Nos. 134, 139–40, 158, 287, 297, 1136, 1180, 1201, 1205, 1226, 1421, 1436, and many others, catch my eye in turning over a few pages of Vol. I.

[2] Fifth ed., London, 1872.

[3] Minute of 18th September 1789, para. 46. Madras Reprint, p. 564.

[4] Letter No. 2212, etc., Vol. I., and Index to Vol. IV.

In this conclusion we now know that Cornwallis erred. It is impossible for a modern Indian official, conversant with the records, to escape the conviction that in 1790 the East India Company's servants in Bengal were mere amateurs in rural administration. Nor are they to be blamed. Until a few years before that date, the commercial business of the Company and its annual 'Investment' engrossed many of the best officers, and afforded the most lucrative career. Warren Hastings himself seems to have owed his appointment as Governor-General to the high opinion which the Court of Directors had formed of his 'plan which has so much improved our Investments' at Madras. Nor had the District Officers in Bengal ever come into that direct contact with peasant proprietary bodies, from which in Madras, Bombay, and North-Western Provinces, the true principles of revenue assessments were afterwards evolved. They had no conception of the detailed survey, or of the official record of rights, which are now recognised as fundamental preliminaries to an equitable land settlement. But even if they had had the clearest ideas on these subjects, the Company's servants in Bengal were then so few in numbers, and so destitute of scientific appliances, or of a trained surveying staff, that it would have been impossible to carry such ideas into execution. The same records which lead us to recognise the high qualities of many of the Company's officials at that period, also compel us to admit that they had not the accumulated knowledge required for a just settlement of a province.

John Shore, the ablest of Lord Cornwallis' advisers, realised this as keenly before the event as we realise it a century after. His four elaborate minutes of the

year 1789,[1] previous to his departure for Europe, set forth the very same arguments against Lord Cornwallis' haste after permanence, as those on which we now condemn it. As regards the landholders, the area and even the boundaries of many of their estates were unknown; and their actual rent roll was a mere estimate. As regards the cultivators, the rates at which they were liable to pay, although 'established' by custom, had never been ascertained. 'The exact sum to be paid by them,'[2] and which was to form their essential protection in their statutory leases, could seldom be stated. As regards all classes of underholders, 'the rights of the tálukdárs[3] dependent on the zamíndárs as well as of the ráiyats, are imperfectly understood and defined.'[4]

Lord Cornwallis based his main argument for at once declaring the Ten Years' Settlement permanent, on broad economic grounds. 'I may safely assert,' he wrote on the 18th September 1789, in reply to Mr. Shore's first two minutes, 'that one-third of the Company's territory in Hindustan is now a jungle inhabited only by wild beasts. Will a ten years' lease induce any proprietor to clear away that jungle, and encourage the ráiyats to come and cultivate the lands, when, at the end of that lease, he must either submit to be taxed *ad libitum* for their newly-cultivated lands, or lose all hopes of deriving any benefit from his labour, for which

[1] Dated 18th June 1789, 18th September 1789 (two), and 8th December 1789. The four are given *in extenso* in Appendices I. and V. to the Fifth Report. Madras Reprint, 1866.

[2] Regulation VIII. of 1793, clause lvii. sub-section (1).

[3] See Letters Nos. 1632–33, Vol. I., and many others under the headings TALUKDARS and ZAMINDARS in Index to Vol. IV., indicating that the subject continued under discussion down to the very time of the Permanent Settlement, and after Shore penned these words.

[4] John Shore's Minute of 8th December 1789.

perhaps at that time he will hardly be repaid? I must own that it is clear to my mind that a much more advantageous tenure will be necessary, to incite the inhabitants of this country to make those exertions which can only effect any substantial improvement.'[1] He asks whether a ten years' lease, under such circumstances, would not, 'in any part of the world where the value of property is known,' 'be called a cruel mockery.'[2]

In his final reply to Mr. John Shore's objections as a whole, he again insists on the twenty years already 'employed in collecting information.'[3] He declares the lesson of those twenty years to be that 'no previous assurances, however solemn, could convince the zamíndárs that Government would, at the expiration of their leases, be contented with less than the highest rent that could be exacted from their lands.'[4] He thus, by a somewhat strained analogy, forces the argument from experience into his service as regards the landholders. He also points out that the cultivators will be fully protected. 'Whoever cultivates the land, the zamíndárs can receive no more than the established rent.'[5] 'The rents of an estate are not to be raised by the imposition of new *abwábs* or taxes . . . No zamíndár claims a right to impose new taxes on the land in cultivation.'[6] 'The rents of an estate can only be raised by inducing the ráiyats to cultivate the more valuable articles of produce, and to clear the extensive tracts of waste lands

[1] Governor-General's Minute of 18th September 1789, Appendix V., Fifth Report. Madras Reprint, p. 592.

[2] *Idem*, p. 591.

[3] Governor-General's Minute of the 3rd February 1790, Appendix V. to Fifth Report. Madras Reprint, p. 620.

[4] *Idem*, p. 619. [5] *Idem*, p. 615. [6] *Idem*, p. 615.

which are to be found in almost every zamíndárí in Bengal.'[1]

Lord Cornwallis did not shrink from facing the argument against permanence based on the probable fall in the value of the rupee—the currency in which he proposed to fix the land tax for ever. He was prepared to give up the right of the State to enhance on this ground, for the same reason that he was prepared to give up the right of the State to enhance on the ground of extended cultivation—namely, to secure the prosperity of the landed classes, and indirectly through them of the whole population. 'Equally favourable,' he says, in his summing up of the points at issue between himself and John Shore,—'equally favourable to the contributors is the probable alteration in the value of silver. For there is little doubt but that it will continue to fall, as it has done for centuries past, in proportion as the quantity drawn from the mines, and thrown into the general circulation, increases. If this be admitted, the assessment will become gradually lighter, because, as the value of silver diminishes, the landholder will be able, upon an average, to procure the quantity which he may engage to pay annually to Government, with a proportionably smaller part of the produce of his lands, than he can at present.'[2]

The Court of Directors, with whom the final decision rested, had therefore the arguments on both sides fairly and fully placed before them. When, in 1792, they arrived at their decision, they had also the actual experience of two years in the practical working of the Decennial Settlement. That Settlement, although nominally introduced throughout Bengal in February

[1] Governor-General's Minute of 3rd February 1790, Appendix V. to Fifth Report. Madras Reprint, p. 616.

[2] *Idem*, p. 611.

1790,[1] had been gradually formed in the several Districts during the preceding years. Separate sets of rules for Bengal, Behar, and Orissa had been drawn up under Shore's guidance, and were afterwards embodied as Regulation VIII. of 1793. The Letters now summarised in these four volumes prove that the Decennial Settlement was introduced not *per saltum* throughout the Provinces as a whole, but on a review of the circumstances of each locality, and District by District.[2] A revised code of rules was promulgated for its practical working in November 1791. It was on the information thus acquired, and on a full review of the arguments in favour of permanence and in favour of delay, that the Court of Directors resolved in September 1792 to declare the Decennial Settlement permanent.

They clearly set forth the reasons for their decision.[3] They allow full weight to John Shore's objections, and state them with a terse vigour that Shore might have envied—'objections which are very serious in themselves, and have considerably impressed our minds. These are drawn from the still imperfect knowledge of our Government respecting the real resources of the different divisions of the Provinces, as well as of the respective rights of zamíndárs, tálukdárs, and ráiyats; from its inability to discriminate what parts of the taxes actually levied from the two classes by the zamíndárs

[1] Circular Letter from the Board of Revenue to the Collectors of Bengal, No. 1570, Vol. I.

[2] See, among many others, Letter No. 1526 (Nov. 1789) for Midnapur District. Circular Letter No. 1529 in the following month announced the resignation of John Shore as the President of the Board of Revenue.

[3] In their Letter to Bengal, dated 19th September 1792. I reproduce the following quotations of its paragraph from *The Zemindary Settlement of Bengal*, vol. i. Appendix XVI. p. 390, *et seq*. Calcutta, 1879.

ought to be sanctioned by Government in a Permanent Settlement; from the uncertainty of accomplishing that Settlement with a due regard to the rules prescribed for it; and especially from the extreme difficulty of forming and executing such regulations as shall secure to the great body of ráiyats the same equity and certainty as to the amount of their rents, and the same undisturbed enjoyment of the fruits of their industry, which we mean to give to the zamíndárs themselves.' 'Very clear and solid arguments were requisite to dispel the diffidence which this view of the subject, from such an authority, had a tendency to create.'

Notwithstanding their full appreciation of the objections, the Court of Directors declared the Settlement permanent. They did so not from any 'aristocratical prejudices,' as Mill informs us, but on the broad economic grounds set forth by Lord Cornwallis. They regarded Bengal, Behar, and Orissa as a vast estate, of which one-third of the cultivable land lay waste. I say distinctly of the cultivable land.[1] They could not reclaim the land themselves. They did not believe that any inducement short of a permanent tenure and a fixed assessment would tempt private individuals to reclaim it. After long deliberation, they decided that it was good policy to surrender their claims to any future increase of revenue, whether from such reclamations or from other sources connected with the land, in order to encourage the great work of extending and improving the cultivated area of Bengal. They thought that they would find themselves repaid by the general increase of revenue to be derived from the growth of the population and the material development of the country. They

[1] On the authority of Colebrooke, *post*, p. 86.

were convinced, to use their own striking words, that the magic touch of property would set a certain 'productive principle' in operation, which would abundantly recompense them in the future for the sacrifices that they then made. If ever there was a great question of administration decided upon what seemed at the time to be sound economic arguments, it was the Permanent Settlement of Bengal.

It would be unfair not to add, that the Court were also guided by considerations of a higher character than enter into ordinary business routine. They believed that the scheme of declaratory leases (*pattas*) would afford the same security to the cultivators which an unalterable land tax could give to the landholders. A fixed rent and a fixed land tax formed equally essential and integral features of their conception of a Permanent Settlement. Nor were they less hopeful of the aid which such a Settlement would render to the better government of the Province.[1] 'No conviction is stronger in our minds than that . . . of all the generated evils of unsettled principles of administration, none has been more baneful than frequent variations in the assessment. It has reduced everything to temporary expedient, and destroyed all enlarged views of improvement. Impolitic as such a principle must be at all times, it is particularly so with respect to a dependent country, paying a large annual tribute, and deprived of many of its ancient supports. Such a country requires especially the aid of a productive principle of management. . . . Long leases, with a view to the gradual establishment

[1] The following sentences are quoted from the Court's Despatch of the 19th September 1792, as given in *The Zemindary Settlement of Bengal*, p. 393, without verification.

of a permanent system, though recommended upon the ground of safety, we must think would still continue in a certain degree the evils of the former practice; periodical corrections in the assessment would be, in effect, of the nature of a general increase, and would destroy the hope of a permanent system, with the confidence of exertion it is calculated to inspire.'

The authors of the Permanent Settlement treated the State rights in the land as a common fund, to be parcelled out afresh between the State, the landholders, and the cultivators. By giving up certain rights of the State, they believed that they were strengthening all the other classes concerned in the possession and tillage of the soil. They clearly perceived the surrender of revenue which they were making, both in the present and in the future. But they believed that the fiscal sacrifice would be repaid by the prosperity and contentment of the people, and by the increased stability of the British rule. What they did not foresee was the hardships which their haste after permanence would impose alike on the landlords and on the tenants.

# CHAPTER V.

## DISAPPOINTING RESULTS OF THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT AS REGARDS THE LANDHOLDERS.

IT soon became apparent that the Permanent Settlement failed to realise the benevolent intentions of its authors. In dealing with these disappointing results, however, it is needful to distinguish between imperfections in form which might have been set right by amendments of the law, and fundamental errors which no subsequent legislation could remedy.

Even the first and more superficial class of defects were sufficiently serious. In a voluminous code, bristling with terms of uncertain meaning, there was no attempt at a chapter of definitions such as now forms an essential preliminary to every great Indian law. The Permanent Settlement attempted to give legal precision to a vast number of usages, whose force and practical application had never been ascertained. It attempted to create a uniform system of title out of a growth of proprietary and possessory tenures, whose conflicting limits had never been settled. The areas of the zamíndárs' estates were unknown. The areas of their private or 'maintenance' lands were unknown.[1] The areas of the rent-

[1] The *sír*, *nij-jot*, *khámár*, and *nánkár* lands or *mahâls;* the inquiries regarding them may be traced in the Letters throughout my four volumes of Records; see, for example, under heading NANKAR, Index to Vol. IV. Those inquiries left the area still an unknown quantity.

free grants[1] within their estates of the 'service lands,'[2] whether legally or illegally held, were unknown. The area of their revenue-paying land[3] was unknown. 'The limits of the villages are left undetermined by any marked boundaries,' wrote John Shore on the eve of the Settlement. 'The quantity of land in each, although stated in *bíghas*, is confessedly unascertained.'[4]

Even in regard to the all-important question of Waste Lands, whose vast extent and difficulties of reclamation determined both Cornwallis and the Court of Directors to declare the Settlement permanent, the area was absolutely unknown in any District. H. Colebrooke, who made a special study of this question at the time, and who had for years afterwards the fullest opportunity of watching the effects of the Permanent Settlement in regard to it, has recorded the result as follows. The estimate that one-third of the Company's territories lay waste may, he says, 'be understood as applicable to lands fit for cultivation, and totally exclusive of lands barren and irreclaimable.'[5] The subject received the continuous attention of the Bengal Government from 1783 onwards, as attested by the four volumes of Letters now summarised.[6] Yet the framers of the Permanent Settlement ten years later had no area-returns for these vast tracts, which they then parted with for

[1] *Lákhiraj;* see under headings RENT-FREE LANDS, JAGIR, etc., Index to Vol. IV.

[2] *Chákrán*, ordered to be assessed by Letter No. 1865, Vol. I.; but the area never ascertained. See, among many letters, those under CHAKRAN, Vol. IV.

[3] *Málguzári.* [4] John Shore's Minute of 8th December 1789, para. 43.

[5] Mr. Colebrooke's Minute (no date), para. 14. Given in full in the *Selection of Papers from the Records of the East India House*, vol. i. p. 46, folio 1820.

[6] For a few out of many, see under heading WASTE LANDS, Vol. IV.

ever. They could not tell the acreage or the boundaries of the revenue-paying lands, and of the non-revenue paying waste, in any estate. 'As they are now disposed of,' wrote Shore, 'there is no criterion for determining the quantity.' 'I think the Government ought to know what it gives, and the proprietor what he receives.'[1]

The Government might relinquish its own claims to unoccupied tracts and valuable forests, whether they lay within a settled estate or not;[2] but it could not give away the rights of the cultivators to the 'waste' or pasture lands attached to the village commune, and necessary for the subsistence of the village cattle. Yet no authoritative record was made of the quantity or boundaries of such lands. The mode of determining their extent was the old one of Kází Fakr-ud-din. The village watchman took his stand on the margin of the cultivated fields round the hamlet, and gave a shout,—a rough test of distance as ancient as the Buddhist *Játakas.* The uncultivated land as far as his voice reached was held to be the pasture for the village cattle, and the joint property of the resident husbandmen. Beyond that distance, it was regarded, by Muhammadan law, as waste land belonging to the State. The Permanent Settlement made over rights of the Government to the waste, but it provided no better means for deciding where the pasture lands ended and where the waste began.

[1] John Shore's Minute of 8th December 1789, para. 44.

[2] It eventually made a few well-founded exceptions, such as the Sundarbans, or uninhabited swamps and jungles at the extremity of the delta; *chars* or islands formed in the rivers, and other alluvial accretions since the Decennial Settlement; also lands that had not come under that Settlement, and were specially let out on clearing leases by the Government. See Regulation II. of 1819, section 3.

[3] *Sáma Játaka*, *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, April 1894, p. 222.

The want of a survey, and the absence of any record of rights, led to endless confusion, and to the ruin of many of the landholders, during the fifteen years following the Permanent Settlement. The story is traced in the Letters summarised in Volumes II., III., and IV. of the present series. These defects might, however, have been remedied by supplemental surveys. An ineffectual proposal was indeed made to register estates paying revenue direct to Government in 1793;[1] and a further effort was renewed in 1800 to remedy its failure.[2] The insufficient provisions in the Permanent Settlement for the administration of justice and of the police were, as a matter of fact, remedied by later legislation. But one immediate effect of that Settlement was to open the floodgates of land litigation and of land aggressions, which swamped the few and distant courts. In such litigation the rightful owners could produce no authoritative record of area or of boundaries. The preliminary question of possession was constantly decided by hired club-men, a band of whom became a recognised part of a zamíndár's establishment. The ultimate question of proprietary right was too often determined by forged papers and hard swearing, or by the power of one of the parties to exhaust the resources of the other with the chicanery of delays and appeals. Many an ancient family in Bengal, who had survived centuries of anarchy, was now ruined by due course of law.

But while these deficiencies in regard to legal machinery and an authoritative record of rights were susceptible of amendment, there were fundamental defects in the Permanent Settlement which no subse-

[1] By Regulation XLVIII. of 1793.

[2] By Regulation VIII. of 1800.

quent legislation could redress. It was in fact an effort to reduce to a single simple rule a state of things that was essentially complex and multiform. It tried to suddenly substitute contract for custom, and to hastily formulate unascertained usages into rights enforceable by law. Lord Cornwallis supposed that he was strengthening the former status of the zamíndárs and landed classes at the cost of the rights of the Government. He was in reality subverting their former status, and bringing about a social and an agrarian revolution, in which the old landed classes went down, and new ones came to the top. The uniform legislative title which he created for the zamíndárs proved incompatible with, and destructive of, the mixed status which they had held by custom and by official grant.

This unexpected fact emerges in every branch of the rural administration during the fifteen years following the Permanent Settlement.[1] I must here confine myself to a single one of its results—the breaking up of the old landed properties of Bengal, by the operation of the Sale Laws. Under the previous system, the machinery for enforcing arrears of the land tax from the zamíndárs and revenue farmers was complex, and seems at first sight excessively harsh. Apart from the use of the lash and other severities,[2] which the East India Company gave up for ever, after 1765, the procedure against a defaulter down to the time of the Decennial

[1] It is visible in hundreds of the Letters now summarised, from No. 3300 at the beginning of Vol. II. to No. 14,136 at the end of Vol. IV.

[2] Such as 'hanging up by the feet, bastinadoing, setting them [the zamíndárs] in the sun in summer, and by stripping them naked and sprinkling them frequently with cold water in winter,' practised in the time of Murshid Kulí Khán, 1704–1726.—Stewart's *History of Bengal*, p. 237. Calcutta edition, 1847.

Settlement in 1789, may be briefly stated as follows. When a zamíndár fell into arrears with his land tax, he was arrested, and his goods and estate, or part thereof, were attached by the local agents of the Government. Then began a graduated process of squeezing. If the zamíndár was an important personage, or a good briber, the attachment of his lands and the confinement of his person were at first almost nominal. Sometimes the revenue bailiffs did not even oust the zamíndár's land-officers from the actual collection of the revenue, while the restraint placed on the liberty of the zamíndár himself merely amounted to a respectful surveillance of his movements.[1]

If these mild measures failed to make the defaulter pay up, or if he were slack in his bribes to the revenue underlings, the process of compulsion rapidly developed. The attachment[2] of his lands and goods went on to dispossession[3] of his estate. The surveillance of his person[4] passed through the various stages from restraint in his own house, or palace, to being brought under guard to the Collector's headquarters, confinement within the precincts of the Collector's court, and imprisonment in the District jail. The final turn of the screw was to drag the defaulter before the supreme revenue authorities in

[1] See, for example, Letter No. 651, from the Rájá of Bardwán, petitioning 'that the process officer (*Názir*) and peons placed over him be recalled,' 26th April 1784.

[2] See the numerous Letters given under heading ATTACHMENT OF LANDS, in Index to Vol. IV.

[3] It should also be noted that dispossession was also resorted to in other cases, as when a zamíndár 'absconded,' or refused to return to his estate, or declined to engage for it at the land tax demanded by the Government. See, for example, Letters No. 506 (for absence), No. 1419 (for inattention to business), etc.

[4] See the many Letters cited under CONFINEMENT FOR ARREARS OF REVENUE, Index to Vol. IV.

Calcutta,[1] where the process of squeezing began afresh, and the degree of restraint varied, according to the bribes paid to the native subordinates, from enlargement on bail to rotting in the debtors' prison.

The last paragraphs describe the procedure against defaulters whose rank, or ability to bribe, secured considerate treatment. The Board of Revenue's correspondence now summarised proves that it was applied, down to the eve of the Decennial Settlement, alike to the most powerful and to the most ancient nobility of Bengal. Of the two wardens of the western marches, whose semi-independence had been respected even by the Muhammadan Viceroy, Murshid Kúlí Khán,[2] we find the Rájá of Bishnupur brought down to Calcutta under a revenue writ in 1785[3], and the Rájá of Bírbhúm dispossessed in 1786.[4] The most powerful nobleman of the interior Districts, the Rájá of Bardwán, exhibits the complete process, from attachment of his lands and goods[5] to confinement of his person.[6] Theoretically, it was also possible to exact the arrear from the guarantor who had stood security for the zamíndár when he obtained his grant or *sanad*.[7] In the case of smaller men, the procedure consisted of promptly attaching their lands and goods, dispossessing them of their estates, and throwing them into prison.

This system, although cruel to the defaulters, proved unprofitable to the Government. For, when its severities were exhausted, the question remained what to do with

[1] *Khálsá*. [2] *Ante*, p. 33. [3] Letter No. 963, Vol. I.

[4] *Inter alia*, Letter No. 120, Vol. I.

[5] Letter No. 1180 (which applied to several other of the chief rájás and zamíndárs of Bengal), No. 1385, etc.

[6] Letter No. 1365, etc. [7] *Ante*, p. 40. Letter No. 1311, etc.

the lands that were attached, and with the person of a zamíndár who had been imprisoned. The household effects of a small zamíndár, or tenure-holder, seldom sufficed to liquidate his arrears. His lands had either to be let out to a revenue farmer, who was often a man of straw, and who almost always oppressed the cultivators, in whom he had no personal or permanent interest. The cultivators, on their side, made it very difficult for a temporary tax-farmer to collect the land dues, and, when backed by the secret influence of a strong dispossessed zamíndár, they sometimes refused to pay altogether, or absconded in a body. The Collector of a District in which many of the zamíndárs had been ousted for arrears, was harassed by perpetual complaints of 'oppressions' and 'exactions' against the revenue farmers to whom he had let the estates of the defaulters, and with counter-complaints from the farmers against the cultivators. The ousted zamíndár fomented and enjoyed the confusion; bands of club-men appeared on the scene; passive resistance to the revenue farmer grew into armed opposition; and the Collector had to seek some means of avoiding the discredit of having to call upon the troops. If his District got out of hand, he knew that his superior officers would judge of him by the fact, without inquiring too deeply into causes.

Meanwhile the imprisoned zamíndár was not idle. He bombarded the Collector with petitions, and corrupted the native subordinates with bribes. Moreover, the prolonged imprisonment of a great zamíndár, or of a number of small ones, was felt to be a scandal alike by the local population, and at headquarters in Calcutta. By the time that the revenue administration of the estate or District had got thoroughly thrown out of gear, and the

revenue farmers had either squeezed a handsome profit, or been ruined by the opposition of the cultivators and the machinations of the zamíndárs, the Collector was glad of any pretext for enfranchising the dispossessed landholders, and again placing them in charge of their estates. In some cases of powerful zamíndárs, indeed, the revenue farmers feared to come forward at all; and the estate remained under attachment in the British Collector's hands. In other cases the zamíndárs managed, by bribery and intrigue, to secure that the attachment should be laid on parts[1] of their estates which yielded so poor a return that no revenue farmer would offer the land tax allotted to it.

When, from whatever cause, an attached estate could not be leased, the Collector had to manage it by his own officers.[2] This arrangement sometimes enabled a Collector of exceptional ability and industry, not only to realise the arrears, but to gain valuable information regarding the actual condition of the landed property in his District. As a rule his officers[3] encountered the opposition of all classes connected with the estate, from the zamíndár down to the village accountant and the cultivators of the soil. His underlings were strangers, and in many cases merely hired for the job. The whole body of Resident Cultivators knew that the ousted zamíndár would sooner or later come to his own again, and the less they paid in the meanwhile, the sooner

[1] *Mahâls* or *tâluks.*

[2] Technically 'to hold it *khás*.' The KHÁS MAHALS referred to in the lengthy list of Letters under that heading in Index to Vol. IV., came under direct management partly by default, and partly by the refusal of zamíndárs to engage for their estates at the revenue fixed by the Government on them.

[3] Headed by a *sazáwal* or manager put into possession by the Collector, sometimes called merely the *amil* or agent.

would the British Collector get tired of the business. Indeed, a Collector found it impracticable to hold the direct land management of any large proportion of his District in his own hands. His own administrative duties gave him as much work as he could possibly get through, without taking on himself the duties of the zamíndárs.

The orders of the Court of Directors and the injunctions of Parliament were in favour of maintaining the intermediary agency of the zamíndárs. The Government in Calcutta, from 1772 onwards, felt it discreditable to their system that any large proportion of zamíndárs should be kept on the dispossessed list. The payment to them of their allowances during dispossession sometimes left an actual loss to the treasury. In short, superior authority and public policy combined with the personal convenience of the Collector in favour of the re-entry of the zamíndár. A part of the arrear was sometimes, but not always, liquidated by the person who had stood security for the zamíndár when he obtained his *sanad.* The remainder was carried on as a floating balance, or struck off as an irrecoverable arrear, and the ousted zamíndár again obtained possession of his estate, sometimes, indeed, at a reduced land tax.[1]

The procedure for realising arrears before the Permanent Settlement acted as a system of rural bankruptcy relief for revenue defaulters. In appearance harsh, its rigours were directed chiefly to the person of the debtor, and at the end it left his estate in his own hands, or in those of his heir, generally intact. We see

[1] See the irrecoverable balance, aggregating three-fifths of the whole revenue from 1762–63 to 1764–65; also from 1772 to 1777, with John Shore's remarkable statement about the universal reduction of rates even during the currency five years' leases, *ante*, pp. 74, 75.

the great landed families of Bengal struggling on under this system in the Letters from 1782, the year with which these volumes open, to the introduction of the Decennial Settlement in 1789–90.[1] The same process went on in the great Bengal estates, of which we have an account during the period preceding the Imperial grant of Bengal to the Company.[2] This process was quite distinct from outrages such as those to which the Muhammadan Viceroy subjected the Bengal landholders in the first quarter of the century. 'In order to enforce the payment of the revenues,' his deputy 'ordered a pond to be dug, which was filled with everything disgusting; and the stench of which was so offensive as nearly to suffocate whoever approached it. To this shocking place, in contempt of the Hindus, he gave the name of *Baikúnt*, which in their language means Paradise; and, after the zamíndárs had undergone the usual punishments, if their rent was not forthcoming, he caused them to be drawn, by a rope tied under their arms, through this infernal pond. He is also stated to have compelled them to put on loose trousers, into which were introduced live cats. By such cruel and horrid methods he extorted from the unhappy zamíndárs everything they possessed, and made them weary of their lives.'[3]

[1] See, among many others, Letters Nos. 1180, 1302, 1331, 1385, for cases of attachment of estates, etc. (and No. 1444 for joint process of attachment of lands and arrest of the zamíndár's person); Nos. 506, 1226, 1419, 1659, for the procedure by dispossession of zamíndárs; Nos. 297, 1311, 1365, 1421, for the confinement of zamíndárs (or Nos. 1224 and 1296 for confinement first in the District and then in Calcutta); also the long list of Letters quoted under the heading SALE OF LANDS in Index to Vol. IV.

[2] For example, in Rájsháhi, Ocra, Penjora (Dinájpur), and Bardwán, as recorded in the Bengal Revenue Consultations for 1786, cited by Rouse, *Dissertation*, pp. 242–253, Appendix IV. London, 1791.

[3] Major Charles Stewart's *History of Bengal*, compiled chiefly from Persian writers, p. 237. Calcutta edition, 1847.

Such severities were condemned by public opinion as irregular and excessive, although flogging was practised on revenue farmers down to the establishment of the Company's administration in 1765. But the ordinary procedure, before as after that event, consisted in attaching the defaulter's goods and lands, dispossessing him of his estate, confinement more or less rigorous of his person, usually ending with his return to his property.[1] It acted, I have said, as a rural bankruptcy law, more or less harsh in its operation against the person, but seldom totally destructive of an ancient estate.

For this time-honoured, complex, and ineffectual procedure, the Permanent Settlement eventually substituted a single sharp process—the sale of the defaulting zamíndár's lands. At first, indeed, it contemplated the continuance of the old machinery of confinement of the defaulter,[2] and of his sureties, together with the attachment of their lands,[3] and the sale of his and their other property, real and personal, besides that of the zamíndárí lands on which the balance had arisen.[4] But the rise in the value of property which set in after the Decennial Settlement in 1789–90 rendered the sale of the defaulter's

[1] Take a single case in 1740 A.D. 'In 1146 [Bengal era], the zamíndárí of Utar, Sirupur, and Patlada, etc., was takan by Rámkánta. However, as he could not realise the balances of Government, the zamíndárís above mentioned were, through the means of Mustapha Khán, given to Debí Prasádh; he held them for some time; they afterwards came into the possession of Rámkánta as formerly.'—Bengal Consultations, quoted in Rouse's *Dissertation*, p. 248, Appendix IV.

[2] Regulation XIV. of 1793, sections 3, 4, 5, etc.

[3] *Idem*, section 24, *et seq*.

[4] *Idem*, section 44. The immediate effect of the Decennial Settlement was not to abolish the procedure by confinement, but to restrict it within narrower limits. See for examples, Letters Nos. 2085, 2118, 2229, 2288, 2298, in 1791 and 1792.

estate an adequate means by itself of realising such arrears. The confinement of defaulting zamíndárs was given up by law in 1794, 'the Governor-General in Council considering their property alone a sufficient security for the public dues.'[1] The popular idea is practically correct, that the Permanent Settlement substituted the simple process of sale of the defaulting estate for the complex procedure against the defaulter's person and property. It tried to give the decayed landholders of Bengal a new lease of life, by wiping out all balances of more than twelve years' standing.[2] It also effected a general jail-delivery of landholders in confinement for arrears.[3]

The result of this apparently milder procedure was to give the last stroke to the ruin of the ancient landed families in Bengal. The Permanent Settlement declared that, in return for the relinquishment of the right of the State to enhance the land tax, it would enforce the punctual and undeviating discharge of the fixed rate. It warned the landholders that on any failure of payment, from whatsoever cause, 'a sale of the whole of the lands of the defaulter, or such portion as may be sufficient to make good the arrear, will positively and invariably take place.'[4]

Unfortunately such words as 'punctually,' 'posit-

[1] Preamble to Regulation III. of 1794, section 1.

[2] That is, twelve years previous to the Decennial Settlement. Proposed by Mr. Chapman in 1790, Letter No. 1833. See also No. 1974, etc.

[3] Circular Letter No. 1837, Sept. 3, 1790. But the release was originally intended to apply only to imprisoned zamíndárs whose lands would suffice by public sale to discharge their arrears of revenue. Afterwards all zamíndárs were set free. The numerous Letters cited after 1794, in Vols. II., III., and IV., under heading CONFINEMENT, should be studied individually.

[4] Article VI. of Governor-General's Proclamation of the 22nd March 1793, embodied in Regulation I. of 1793, section 7.

ively,' and 'invariably' were a new language to the great landed houses of Bengal, and one which they were too old to learn. Under the Muhammadan system, each of them was compelled by law to keep up a body of armed retainers; and these formed in the aggregate the militia of the Mughal Empire,[1] as distinguished from the royal armies. The contingent for which every Revenue Circle was responsible is set forth in the *Aín-í-Akbarí;* the total being 894,790 infantry, 26,975 cavalry, and 452 elephants, for the Provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa.[2] These numbers had been reduced during the seventeenth century; but down to the time of the Permanent Settlement a body of armed retainers formed an essential part of the establishment of every great zamíndár. His personal dignity and social status depended on their maintenance, and the last relics of his authority that a decayed rájá parted with were his horsemen and elephants.

These household troops of the ancient landholders of Bengal had formed alternately a menace and a support to the East India Company. To take the example of a single zamíndár. In 1755, the Rájá of Bardwán was accused of 'stopping the Honorable Company's business transacted in his Provinces, and seizing their effects.'[3] In 1760, the Rájá of Bardwán threatened to join the

[1] The *Bhúmí*, or land-wehr.

[2] As then constituted; not quite equal to the present Lieutenant-Governorship of Bengal. I have added up the total from the details for the various revenue divisions furnished by the *Aín-í-Akbarí*, pp. 178 to 200 of Gladwin's Translation, vol. ii. (ed. 1800). The aggregate given for Bengal at p. 16 of the same Vol. is 801,158 infantry, 23,330 cavalry, 170 elephants, 4260 cannon, 14,400 boats.

[3] Bengal Consultations of April 1, 1755, quoted in Long's *Selections from Unpublished Records*, No. 147, p. 56. Calcutta, 1869.

Maráthás, and, with the help of other zamíndárs, to seize Murshidábád on his own account.[1] In the same year he had attacked the English with a force of 800 men, in which action, reported our Commanding Officer, 'I am sorry to say we have been greatly worsted, the sergeant and about fifty sepoys killed on the spot; Mr. Brown and some others slightly wounded.'[2] This was only one of a series of insults and attacks perpetrated by the Bardwán Rájá's troops. Three years after the battle of Plassey had given the virtual possession of Lower Bengal to the Company, its officer reported the numbers of the Bardwán forces at '5000 strong.' Later in the year he had collected from ten to fifteen thousand men, and 'intends to fight'[3] in conjunction with the Bírbhúm Rájá. Next year, 1761, he complains that the English had entered one of his forts 'and seized the cannon.'[4] Only by persistent measures, including the stationing of marines from the fleet at Bardwán, was the Rájá's power broken.

As late as 1767 the number of the Bardwán Rájá's armed retainers[5] throughout his estates was returned at 'above 8500,' besides 'inferior ones,' costing Rs. 154,521[6] in cash from the revenue, in addition to their customary allowances. In the same year, 648 of his household troops, on salaries aggregating Rs. 76,092 per annum, were disbanded by the British agent;[7] but enough remained to enable the Bardwán Rájá to give annoyance to the Government, and to heavily burden his own

[1] *Idem*, No. 519, p. 244.

[2] *Idem*, No. 468, Proceedings of July 1, 1760, p. 217.

[3] *Idem*, No. 507, p. 239.

[4] *Idem*, No. 539, p. 250.

[5] 'Cutwals and pykes.'

[6] Long's *Selections from Unpublished Records*, Proceedings of Sept. 28, 1767, pp. 507–9.

[7] *Idem*, No. 955, p. 509.

resources. One of the earliest documents summarised in my four volumes is an order to the manager[1] then in charge of the Bardwán estates, 'directing him to assign his reasons for not advancing the pay of the Rájá's household troops.'[2] The long list of Letters cited under the headings DISTURBANCES and EXACTIONS in the index to Volume IV., furnish examples of the existence of similar armed bodies as instruments of oppression or disorders in the hands of other zamíndárs. By degrees the household troops of the great landed families were partially recruited into local militia or *Sibandí* corps,[3] paid and commanded by the Company. But these corps were in turn broken up,[4] and supplied materials for the 'club-men' of the zamíndárs.

It was vain to expect the ancient rájás of Bengal, encumbered with all the costly paraphernalia of their petty courts and military retainers, to suddenly transform themselves into punctual tax-collectors. Yet this was exactly what the Permanent Settlement did expect of them. It applied to their pompous, lax, and extravagant system of management, the same stringent procedure as it applied to the new class of zamíndárs with their shrewd habits of business. It was, as I have said, an attempt to reduce under a single rule a state of things essentially complex and multiform. The ancient houses of Bengal broke down under the strain. In 1795, in two years of the Permanent Settlement, the Government recorded that of the whole arrears outstanding for the

[1] *Sazáwal.*

[2] Letter No. 95, March 4, 1782.

[3] *E.g.* in Bhágalpur District, Letter No. 492, Aug. 25, 1783.

[4] See for example Letters Nos. 856, 907, 908. For subsequent re-establishment of the Sibandí corps, see Letters Nos. 4903, 5100, etc.

Province, 'about one-half is due' from the great zamíndáris of Bírbhúm and Rajsháhí.[1]

The mournful story of the ruin of these and other once powerful families under the Sale Law for arrears is shown in detail in Vols. II. and III. of the Letters now summarised. During two years alone, 1796–98, estates bearing a revenue of Sicca Rs. 5,521,252,[2] more than a fifth of the whole land tax of the Province,[3] were advertised for sale for arrears. For various reasons, this sum exceeded the *bonâ fide* arrears, but within twenty-two years[4] of the Permanent Settlement, from one-third to one-half of the whole landed property in Bengal had been actually sold on that account.[5]

The wave of the Permanent Settlement had, in truth, submerged the ancient houses of Bengal. 'Among the defaulters,' says the Fifth Report, 'were some of the oldest and most respectable families in the country. Such were the Rájás of Nadíyá, Rájsháhí, Bishnupur, Kásí-jora, and others; the dismemberment of whose estates, at the end of each succeeding year, threatened them with poverty and ruin, and in some instances presented difficulties to the revenue officers in their endeavour to preserve undiminished the amount of the public assessment.'[6] 'In fact,' writes a revenue expert, reviewing the whole official evidence on the subject, 'it is scarcely

[1] Revenue Consultations, dated March 27, 1794, para. 15, p. 647, Appendix VI., Fifth Report. Madras Reprint, 1866.

[2] Sicca rupees. Fifth Report, p. 71, Madras Reprint, 1866. The two years were 1203 and 1204 (Bengal era), corresponding to 1796–97 and 1797–98 A.D.

[3] As fixed by the Permanent Settlement at Sicca Rs. 26,800,989.—*Zemíndáry Settlement of Bengal*, i. Appendix XII. p. 285.

[4] In 1815.

[5] Mr. A. D. Campbell, quoted *Zemindary Settlement*, vol. ii. Appendix XVIII. p. 42.

[6] The Fifth Report from the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company. Madras Reprint, vol. i. p. 71.

too much to say that, within the ten years that immediately followed the Permanent Settlement, a complete revolution took place in the constitution and ownership of the estates which formed the subject of that Settlement.'[1]

Amid the general ruin of the ancient landed families of Bengal there was one conspicuous exception. The Rájá of Bardwán soon gave up the struggle to manage his estates under the hard-and-fast rules laid down by the Permanent Settlement, and leased them out in perpetuity to middlemen. These intermediaries did the actual work of collecting the land tax, paid a fixed sum each year to the Rájá, and made as much more as they could out of the cultivators. Such a desertion of responsibility was diametrically opposed to the purposes for which the Permanent Settlement had been framed, and to the declared expectation of its framers that the landholders would devote themselves to improving the condition of the husbandmen. Nevertheless it was gradually discovered that this system formed the only escape from ruin for the ancient houses of Bengal. They could not turn themselves into mere tax-collecting machines like the new zamíndárs, so they created a class of permanent middlemen who took the work off their hands, and who were to the new zamíndárs in regard to keen business habits and compassionless punctuality in enforcing their dues, very much what the new zamíndárs were to the rájá class.

After some hesitation, the Government found itself compelled to recognise the new state of things. The Permanent Settlement had been so jealous of the growth of intermediate tenures, that it prohibited the zamíndárs from giving any lease for longer than twelve

[1] Official Memorandum on the Revenue Administration of the Lower Provinces of Bengal, by Mr. J. Macneile, p. 9. Calcutta, 1873.

years.[1] But the transfer of great estates to middlemen went on in spite of legislative prohibition. Within twenty years after the Permanent Settlement, the practice had got beyond the control of the Government, and the twelve-years' restriction on leases was formally abolished.[2] Seven years later, a large part of Bengal had passed in perpetuity into the hands of middlemen. An enactment in 1819, with a long preamble, recording *inter alia* that the practice had had its origin on the estates of the Rájá of Bardwán, gave the force of law to such transfers, and placed on a legislative basis the modern system of subinfeudation in Bengal.[3]

Under that system many of the ancient landholders sank into the condition of annuitants, drawing a fixed yearly allowance from the middlemen, but cut off from any direct connection with the tillers of the soil. On such estates the cultivators were handed over *en masse* to the intermediaries, whose one object was to wring a profit out of them. By degrees the sons and grandsons of the middlemen acquired something of the sense of duty to their tenants which the hereditary possession of landed property gives, especially in India. But that sense of duty only slowly evolved. During a whole generation, the effect of the Permanent Settlement was to make over vast estates to middlemen, who had not the social position of proprietors, and who made no pretence to the feelings of proprietors towards their tenantry.

The old landholders thus became pensioners, powerless to protect the hereditary cultivators, or to interfere between them and the middlemen; or they fell into

[1] Regulation XLIV. of 1793, section 2.
[2] Regulation V. of 1812, section 2.
[3] The *Patni* system, Regulation VIII. of 1819.

arrears of the land tax, and saw their estates pass entirely away to new men. The ancient and noble houses of Bengal proved, as a class, incapable of managing their domains with the rigid punctuality and under the hard-and-fast rules prescribed by the Permanent Settlement. They could not change in a moment the habits and traditions formed during many generations. The Permanent Settlement allowed them no time to learn to change. The system of subinfeudation alone saved them, as a class, from extinction.

It does not appear that the land tax as assessed for the Permanent Settlement was unduly high. Our officers accepted the rates which the land had been found practically capable of paying. The instructions from the Bengal Government were conceived in a fair spirit.[1] Indeed, 'minute local scrutinies' had been prohibited by the Court of Directors. The actual process is shown in detail in the Letters summarised in these four volumes, and its personal incidents have been well described as follows: 'The Collector sat in his office in the *sadr* (headquarter) station, attended by his right-hand man, the kánúngo, by whom he was almost entirely guided.

[1] 'The Collectors were directed,' wrote John Shore, 'to revert, as far as the accounts and materials in their possession admitted, to the settlements and collections of former years, tracing the diminution which had taken place from the highest rate of taxation, and the cause thereof; and to ascertain whether the latter were of a temporary or permanent operation. Minute local scrutinies were objected to, as contrary to the orders of the Court of Directors. The Collectors were required in every instance to name a specific sum, with their reasons for fixing it; and they were at the same time informed that it was not the intention of Government to levy a heavy increase upon the jumma which could not be collected, but that the amount of the settlement should be such as the Government might fairly exact.'—Mr. Shore's Minute of 18th June 1789, para. 273, Fifth Report, p. 147. Madras Reprint, 1866.

As each estate came up in succession, the brief record of former settlements was read, and the *dehsunny* (*dah-san* =ten years) book, or fiscal register for ten years immediately preceding the cession or conquest, was inspected. The kánúngo was then asked who was the zamíndár of the village. . . . Then followed the determination of the amount of revenue. On this point also reliance was chiefly placed on the *daul*, or estimate of the kánúngo, checked by the accounts of past collections and by any other offers of mere farming speculators which might happen to be put forward.'[1]

John Shore thus describes the net result: 'A medium of the actual produce to Government in former years, drawn from the scanty information which the Collectors had the power of procuring, was the basis on which the assessment of each estate, whether large or small, was ultimately assessed.'[2]

It is difficult to make a trustworthy comparison between the returns of the land revenue at different periods. For not only did the taxable area vary greatly as Districts were added or withdrawn or lost, but the items included under the designation of 'land revenue' were seldom the same. Thus, as regards area, the 'Bengal, Behar, and Orissa' of the days before the Permanent Settlement practically meant Bengal, Behar, and Midnapur,[3] without the Orissa of modern nomen-

[1] Mr. Thornton, in an article in the *Calcutta Review*, reprinted in 1850; quoted in Mr. Baden Powell's admirable *Land Systems of British India*, 3 vols. Clarendon Press, 1892, vol. i. pp. 414–15.

[2] Minute of 18th June 1789, Fifth Report.

[3] The Orissa of that time was the tract between the Rupnáráyan and and Subarnarekhá rivers, now chiefly within the Midnapur District.

clature.[1] As regards the items included, not only are the totals disguised by the inclusion or exclusion of abwábs, and a variety of local taxes[2] indirectly connected with the land revenue administration, but also by the fact that the land revenue was often returned as synonymous with the whole revenues of the Province. In addition to all such difficulties of account, the fact that Bengal was frequently in a state of war or invasion, completely obscures the comparison during the period preceding the Company's rule. After giving close attention to the returns, I referred the question to the present Revenue Secretary at the India Office.[3] His conclusion was that such returns for widely-separated periods are not, in their present form, susceptible of comparison.

If, in spite of this *caveat*, it be still thought necessary to compare the amount of land revenue assessed by the Permanent Settlement of 1793 with the land revenue as assessed by the Muhammadan Government before the grant of Bengal to the Company in 1765, the following are the recorded figures. The Settlement of the Musalman Viceroy, Kásim Alí, for 1762–63, was Sicca Rs. 24,118,912, at a time when Bengal was just emerging from dynastic anarchy and Maráthá invasions.[4] But it is doubtful whether this sum included all the abwábs and miscellaneous taxes;[5] it is certain that it

[1] The 'Province of Benares' was at that time under the Bengal Board of Revenue, but its yield was usually, though not always, shown separately.

[2] Known in the aggregate as *sáír* or *sáyer*.

[3] Sir Charles Bernard, K.C.S.I., who has had an unsurpassed experience in dealing with the *actual* value of Indian totals, both in India and at Westminster.

[4] John Shore's Minute of June 18, 1789, para. 68.

[5] The *Sáír*.

included balances from previous years; and it also seems certain that, although 'detached records of particular Districts are preserved,' the complete return for the whole Province was defective.[1] After a scrutiny of Grant's *Analysis of the Finances of Bengal*,[2] Sir Charles Bernard writes to me: 'Grant's *Analysis* gives the land revenue of the Diwání of Bengal at Sicca Rs. 26,025,499; or, less deductions, Sicca Rs. 25,624,223. Afterwards he adds other items belonging to Behar, Orissa, and Bhagalpur, and also 2½ laks of *sáír*, and makes the total up to Sicca Rs. 40,200,000 for Bengal, Behar, and Orissa.'[3] These figures referred to the concluding years of Muhammadan rule.

The land revenue fixed by the Decennial Settlement of 1789, and practically adopted by the Permanent Settlement of 1793, was Sicca Rs. 26,800,989, after a quarter of a century of freedom from dynastic anarchy and Maráthá invasion. As far as the aggregate figures go, it practically continued the assessment bequeathed to us by the Muhammadan rulers. But it must be remembered that the Muhammadan rulers often failed to enforce their assessment, while the Company's Government had the effective weapon of the Sale Laws for exacting its dues.

For some time after the Permanent Settlement, the landholders found it impossible to collect the rents from the cultivators with the same punctuality that the Government insisted on their payment of the revenue.

[1] John Shore's Minute of 18th June 1789, paras. 69, 70.

[2] Submitted to the Governor-General in Council on 27th April 1786, and reproduced as Appendix IV. to the Fifth Report.

[3] Letter dated 11th December 1893. I reproduce the figures without verification.

The economic relations of labour to land were against them. There was more land in Bengal than there were tenants to till it; and any severity on the part of a zamíndár led to the flight of his Resident Cultivators, as they could obtain holdings at the lower non-resident rates on adjoining properties. The Permanent Settlement deprived the zamíndárs of their old right to levy the rents of absconding or defaulting cultivators from those who remained.[1] It was in vain that the Government, in fear for its revenue, gave the landholders new powers against their tenants. These powers, after passing through various gradations of rigour, developed into the seizure of the tenant's person,[2] and a sharp law of distraint against his property.[3]

But such severities, although they worked harshly against the cultivators in the long-run, came too late to save many of the ancient landholding families of Bengal. The Government was armed from the first with the stringent procedure of the Sale Laws against the zamíndárs; it only by degrees armed the zamíndárs with an equally stringent procedure against their tenants. Indeed, by the time that the Government thoroughly realised the situation, the economic relations of land to labour had changed in Bengal. Twenty more years of peace had done much to restore the equilibrium between the population and the cultivable

[1] Regulation VIII. of 1793, section 63, clause 2, applied strictly to the desertion of cultivators in consequence of 'inundation or other calamity.' But, taken together with the provisions of that and other Regulations, it abolished the whole system of *nájái*, described *ante*, p. 54. See also the *Tagore Law Lectures*, Calcutta, 1874-75, pp. 329, 30.

[2] Regulation VII. of 1799, popularly known as '*huftum*' (*haftum* = Seventh).

[3] Regulation V. of 1812, popularly known as '*punjum*' (*panjum* = Fifth).

area. It was no longer the zamíndárs who were seeking for cultivators, but the cultivators who had begun to seek for land. Almost at the very time that the 'bludgeon law' of 1812 was passed against the tenant, the increase in the yield of estates since 1793 was officially estimated at 36 per cent.[1]

The laws of 1799 and 1812 are so painfully associated in subsequent history with harshness to the cultivators, that it is necessary to emphasise the forgotten fact, that they were at the time considered indispensable for the preservation of the landholders. I therefore quote a remarkable statement by a Bengal administrator, whose authority on such questions is beyond dispute. 'It may not be generally known,' wrote the late Mr. Buckland, 'that the Regulation of 1799 was enacted in order to save the Perpetual Settlement, the existence of which was then imperilled by the excessive independence which the ráiyats (cultivators) enjoyed. For although it is now the custom to say that the rights of the ráiyats were not properly protected in the Perpetual Settlement, it turned out at the time that they could take such good care of their own rights that the zamíndárs could not collect their rents from them until the Government came to the rescue of the zamíndár, and made the ráiyats liable to arrest for default of payment of rent.'[2]

[1] In the proportion of eleven to fifteen. H. Colebrooke's Minute (without date, but sent home with the Bengal Revenue Letter of 17th July 1813), *Selections of Records at the East India House*, vol. i. p. 196, foot-note. Colebrooke summarises the result as 'an improvement in the proportion of one-third of the former produce of the land.'

[2] Report of the Commissioner of Bardwán Division for 1872-73. Commissioners' Reports, p. 80; quoted in *The Zemindary Settlement of Bengal*, Appendix XII. vol. i. pp. 293-94. By Mr. Buckland's recent death the old Civil Service of the Company has lost one of the ablest of its members. No

Another cause contributed to the extinction of the old landed houses of Bengal. Lord Cornwallis declared that one of the objects of the Permanent Settlement was to enfranchise the landholders in regard to the sale of their estates. He found them in the bondage of hopeless indebtedness, yet unable to free themselves from their creditors by selling part of their property, and so obtaining a fresh start on a possibly reformed career. 'To keep them in a state of tutelage,' he wrote,[1] 'and to prohibit them from borrowing money, or disposing of their lands without the knowledge of Government, as we do at present, with a view to prevent them from suffering the consequences of their profligacy and incapacity, will perpetuate these defects. If laws are enacted which secure to them the fruits of industry and economy, and at the same time leave them to experience the consequence of idleness and extravagance, they must either render themselves capable of transacting their own business, or their necessities will oblige them to dispose of their land to others, who will cultivate and improve them.'

For a large proportion of the ancient families of Bengal, the second alternative was the only possible one. They had neither the energy nor the thrift necessary to retrieve their fallen fortunes. Nor had they the training in self-denial requisite for the wise use of the liberty now accorded to them. To many of them

Englishman ever combined in a fuller measure all the qualities of a great Indian administrator. It is to be hoped that some record will appear of a man who rendered the very highest services to Bengal during a long and most important period: but who was allowed to end his days with a far too scanty recognition of them by the State.

[1] Minute by the Governor-General, dated 3rd February 1790, Fifth Report, p. 612. Madras Reprint.

freedom from 'tutelage' practically meant freedom to go to ruin. Their new right of selling their estates gave them facilities for raising money such as they had never before enjoyed. They exercised that right so freely, that within ten years of the Permanent Settlement scarcely one of the old landed properties had escaped dilapidation, and numbers of them were completely broken up. In these four volumes of *Bengal Records*, I cite many hundred Letters written at that disastrous period, and showing how the disintegration of estates went on in every District of Bengal. The landholders grew ingenious in getting the largest amount of purchase-money. A sale under the law for Arrears of Revenue cleared all encumbrances, and so gave a more indisputable title than a private transfer. A practice accordingly developed, of resorting to this method in the case of private transfers of property, or even in foreclosures of mortgage. The vendor made a fictitious default in the payment of the land tax; his estate was put up for sale under the Revenue Laws; and the private purchaser, with whom the matter had been arranged beforehand, bought in the estate at the public auction, freed from all leasehold and other encumbrances. The growth of this practice can be clearly traced in the Letters summarised in my second and third volumes (1794 to 1801).

Not only did the Code of 1793 give the landholders new powers of borrowing on what had become a readily saleable security; it also gave creditors new powers of enforcing old debts. For, while that Code established a sharp public procedure for revenue defaulters, it at the same time created an improved mechanism of law-courts for enforcing private claims. Under the old

system, creditors found it almost impossible to wring payment out of a powerful zamíndár or rájá. A process existed, and the British Courts might be invoked; but the process was costly, the Courts distant, and their decisions difficult to execute. The network of impartial and independent tribunals, which the Code of 1793 spread over Bengal, gave to creditors and mortgagees unprecedented facilities for exacting their bonds. They swooped down with old-standing claims, accumulated by ruinous rates of interest—rates justifiable when they had little chance of ever recovering the principal, but which acted oppressively now that land had become a first-class security.

In many cases the original sum lent had been repaid twice over by the interest paid upon it. But the bond still remained in the hands of the creditor, and the Courts could not at that time go behind the bond. A similar state of things reproduced itself during the present century in Southern India, when the British Land Settlement gave to the inchoate rights of the peasant-holders the value of a well-defined and readily saleable tenure. In Bengal, it was the landholder whose right of property received this sudden development; in Bombay, it was the cultivator. In both cases the power of selling the land enormously increased the power of borrowing upon it. In both, that power was availed of to a disastrous extent. In both, the previous state of general indebtedness had been intensified by high rates of interest—rates legitimate enough (I repeat) when the creditor had no security, or at best a poor one, for the capital sum lent; but unjust and unreasonable when the action of the British Government had turned the old doubtful security into a good one.

Here the analogy ends. In the case of the Peasant Settlement in Southern India, the Government realised the change which its action had produced; in the case of the Settlement with the Landholders in Bengal, it did not. It accordingly stepped in between the Bombay peasant and his creditors by a series of rural Bankruptcy Acts, which, *inter alia*, empowered the Courts to go behind the letter of the bond, and to award what was equitable instead of what was arithmetically due.[1] In Bengal no such provision was made to save the landholders.

On the contrary, the Code of Regulations in which the Permanent Settlement was embodied in 1793, afforded facilities, previously unknown, to creditors for exacting the uttermost farthing. The creditors, moreover, soon discovered that, by a little manipulation, they could use the Revenue Sale Law for the satisfaction of their private claims. It is recorded on indisputable authority, that a large proportion of the transfers recorded in the Letters summarised in my second and third volumes of Bengal Records, although nominally for arrears of the land tax, were in reality the result of underhand arrangements,[2] with a view to securing that private creditors and mortgagees should acquire the estates of their debtors with an unquestionable title and free of all encumbrances. Instead of a series of enactments for the relief of rural insolvent debtors, such as was elaborated for the peasant-holders of the Bombay Presidency in the second half of the present century,

[1] I give a summary of this relief legislation for the Bombay peasantry from 1879 to the Commission of 1892, in the *Indian Empire*, pp. 529–532, 3rd edition, 1893. Allen & Co.

[2] *Bénámí* sales.

the Code of 1793 supplied a bankruptcy procedure of the most stringent sharpness against the landholders of Bengal. While many of the historical houses of that Province fell beneath the guillotine of the Revenue Sale Laws, a still larger number were extinguished by their private creditors and the Civil Courts.

The Permanent Settlement became a success only after it had thus erected a new and shrewder class of landholders on the ruins of the ancient aristocracy of Bengal. It was impossible, by a stroke of the pen, to turn military chiefs and wardens of the marches into punctual tax-collectors. When objections are taken to the large rent-roll of the modern zamíndárs of Bengal, or to their strictly business relations towards their tenants, we should in fairness remember two things. Those zamíndárs are the representatives of a class which we deliberately called into existence to work out the system which we ourselves had imposed on the Province. If they had not dealt with their estates on strictly business principles, they could not have worked out that system at all.

# CHAPTER VI

## FAILURE OF THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT TO PROTECT THE CULTIVATORS

I HAVE explained at some length the disappointing results of the Permanent Settlement of 1793 in regard to the ancient landholders of Bengal. I propose to deal more briefly with its failure to secure the welfare of the cultivators. For, while it has hitherto been generally regarded as a landlord's law, its deficiencies in respect to the tenants have long been acknowledged. The object of this essay is to exhibit the actual effects of the Permanent Settlement on the various landed classes of Bengal, as disclosed in the Manuscript Records at the close of the last century. I have, therefore, been constrained to dwell more fully on those of its results heretofore not understood, than on those which are already recognised.

As regards the cultivators, as we saw with reference to the landholders, certain defects of the Permanent Settlement were incidental, and might have been remedied by subsidiary measures, while others were organic, and could not. Indian jurists have justly laid stress on the fact that, while the Settlement fixed for ever the revenue to be paid by the landholders to the State, it merely gave orders for fixing the rent to be paid by

the cultivators to the lan[illegible]his rent. Such a system, if once bring out the character of what Lo[illegible]rther require the old 'empty injunction'[1] in its true light. For [illegible] by means the root of the agrarian difficulties in Bengal during the past hundred years. Yet it was a defect remediable by supplemental action, and one for which the framers of the Permanent Settlement expressly provided a remedy.

Nothing could be more methodical than the detailed plan laid down by John Shore in 1789 for fixing the rents of the cultivators in each fiscal division.[2] Nothing was more constantly present in the mind of Lord Cornwallis, or more clearly set forth by the Court of Directors, than the necessity of securing to the tenants the same 'certainty as to the amount of their rents, and the same undisturbed enjoyment of the fruits of their industry, which we mean to give to the zamíndárs themselves.'[3] If that certainty was never given to the cultivators, and if their rents were never fixed, it was not from want of good intentions and express instructions on the part of the framers of the Permanent Settlement. It was because their good intentions and their express instructions were not carried out.

This disastrous omission resulted, in part, from the flood of new business with which the Permanent Settlement swamped the district administration of Bengal. Instead of bringing peace, it seemed at first to bring only the sword. Land litigation, land sales, and conflicting rights and claims of every conceivable kind, strained to

[1] Minute by the Governor-General (Lord Moira), dated 21st September 1815.

[2] *Permanent Plan for the Ease and Security of the Ráiyats*, by John Shore, 1789; quoted *ante*, pp. 69, 70.

[3] Court of Directors' Letter to Bengal, dated 19th September 1792.

check on the zamíndárs, and at widely-scattered British the machinery on wh[illegible] multiplied duties in regard to the impartial [illegible]added an attempt to introduce a new system of civil and criminal courts, an attempt to introduce what amounted to a new system of magisterial jurisdiction and police, and an attempt to reorganise the system of local taxation. The District officers were, apart from deficiencies in training, altogether too few to discharge the task thus suddenly thrust upon them. It speaks well for their loyalty and endurance that they managed to scramble through an amount of work which would have taxed the energies of twice their numbers, and that they kept the rural administration going without any general deadlock, during the ten years before effective relief arrived. Lord Cornwallis, in express words, made the future welfare of the cultivators depend on the system of declaratory leases (*pattas*) being "duly enforced by the Collectors."[1] But it was physically impossible for the Collectors to embark on the minute investigation of the rents of the cultivators which Lord Cornwallis contemplated, and which John Shore methodically designed. Before their numerical strength was brought up to a point that would have enabled them to do so, the rural record of rights, on which the success of such an inquiry depended, had disappeared.

This brings us to the organic defects of the Permanent Settlement in regard to the cultivators. We have seen, in Chapter III., how that Settlement endeavoured to substitute for the village record of rights[2] a new system of declaratory leases.[3] Under the new plan, each cultivator was to have a *patta* clearly setting

[1] Governor-General's Minute of 3rd February 1790; quoted *ante*, p. 70.
[2] *Ante*, pp. 57–60.
[3] *Ante*, pp. 66–73.

forth the exact amount of his rent. Such a system, if once completely introduced, would not further require the old apparatus for recording the cultivators' rights by means of the village and District registrars, the patwárís and kánúngos. As the District registrars, or kánúngos,[1] were paid by the State, their services were promptly dispensed with. In 1783 their importance as checks upon the zámindárs had been so fully recognised, that Warren Hastings ordered their re-establishment as an integral part of his system of rural administration.[2] But on the formation of the Decennial Settlement the question of their retention arose,[3] and on the introduction of the Permanent Settlement their office was abolished throughout Bengal and Behar.[4]

Under the Mughal system, as authoritatively described by the *Aín-í-Akbarí*, the kánúngo was at once the officer of record on behalf of the Government, and 'the protector of the husbandman, and there is one in every parganá.'[5] Under the system as reorganised by Warren Hastings in 1783, the chain of supervision extended from the Sadr Kánúngo, or Chief Accountant of Bengal, at the headquarters of the Government, to the petty rural kánúngos, or registrars of Districts and fiscal divisions. It was this body of men that supplied the connecting links between the ruling power and the village registrars, or patwárís, who directly represented the cultivators. The abolition of the kánúngos removed the principal

[1] For their *status* and duties see *ante*, pp. 58, 59.

[2] Letter from the Governor-General, dated 22nd May 1783, No. 430, Vol. I.

[3] Letter No. 1971, Vol. I., 11th March 1791.

[4] Letters Nos. 2916, 2928, 2970, 2987, 3014, etc., Vol. I., July and August 1793.

[5] *Ante*, p. 59.

check on the zamíndárs, and at the same time destroyed the machinery on which the Government depended for impartial information in regard to the demands of the landholders and the rights of the cultivators.[1]

While the District registrars, or kánúngos, paid by the State, were thus abolished, the village registrars, or patwárís, underwent an even more disastrous change. Until 1793 they were the servants of the village community, paid partly by small grants of land from the Government, and partly by allowances from the body of Resident Cultivators. They were, therefore, joint servants

[1] The best contemporary account of the office and duties of the kánúngos, just before the Decennial Settlement, is that given by S. Davis, Esq., Acting Collector of Bhágalpur, in a letter to the Board of Revenue, dated 6th December 1787. Mr. Davis, while conversant with the state of things in Behar, was not aware of the importance which the office had regained in Bengal under Warren Hastings' re-constitution of it in 1783. (Letter No. 430 in my present series of Bengal Records.) After giving a list of the sixteen sets of District accounts which the kánúngos had to keep up under the Mughal Government, Mr. Davis remarks: "These accounts, when carefully taken, gave the complete annual history of a zamíndárí, comprehending the ground in cultivation, particularising the portion of it which paid rent to Government and of that which was held free; the customs and usages established by former amils, and those introduced by the amils of the time being; the amount of rent in demand from every ráiyat, with the balance remaining against any of them at the end of the year; the whole amount of the zamíndár's or farmer's collections, specifying the particular sums under every head in which those collections were made, together with his expenses of collection. In short, the object of the kánúngo's office was to supply such information respecting the country, that no circumstance of advantage in the administration of it should be concealed, nor the zamíndár enabled to appropriate any more of the product of it to himself than the share allotted to him by the Government; that no lands might be separated from the *jamá*, or rent-roll, without authority; and that the real value of the land yielding revenue might be known at the end of one year, as a rule for farming it or keeping it *khás*, or in the hands of the Government, for the next, either of which modes it was the right of the Government to adopt."—Quoted from Appendix III. to Fifth Report. Madras Reprint, vol. i. pp. 219, 220.

of the State and of the village community, 'the depositories of the local usages of the country, from whom it was always easy for the revenue officers of Government to collect correct information regarding the individual rights of the ráiyats, in cases of dispute between them and the zámíndars or farmers.'[1] Under the Permanent Settlement, these hereditary guardians of the rights of the cultivators were suddenly transformed into servants of the landlords.

'By Regulation VIII. of 1793,' wrote the Court of Directors, in recapitulating this extraordinary transaction,[2] 'every zamíndár who hád not established a patwárí in each village within his estate to keep the accounts of the ráiyats, as required by the orignal rules of the Decennial Settlement of the three Provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, was immediately to appoint one in each village, unless in such instances as the Board of Revenue might deem it unnecessary to have a separate one for each.' The registrars of these reformed patwárís were to furnish not only the basis of the ordinary rent-transactions, but also evidence 'to facilitate the decision of suits in the courts of judicature between proprietors and farmers of land, and persons paying rent or revenue to them.'[3]

The more experienced administrators, represented by John Shore, had intended these patwárís to be a new class of registrars, maintained at the cost of the zamín-

[1] Minute by Mr. Rocke, member of the Board of Revenue, 1815, para. 5, Folio i. p. 375 (1820).

[2] In their Revenue Letter to Bengal, para. 82, dated 28th October 1814, quoted in the *Selections from the Records of the East India House*, Folio i. p. 167 (1820).

[3] *Idem.* para. 83, quoting Regulation VIII. of 1793, section 62. Repealed by section 2 of Regulation XII. of 1817.

dár, a class who would take the place to some extent of the State-paid agency of kánúngos abolished by the Permanent Settlement. But, unfortunately for the Bengal cultivators, John Shore left Bengal in the very crisis of their fate. Before he returned as Governor-General the mischief had been done. The landholders, supported by the Regulation of 1793, gradually turned the village patwárís who had been the joint servants of the Government and the village community, into zamindárí servants, working under the orders of the zamindár, and often in his own *kacheri* or land-office. The effect was to change the public and impartial village record of rights, by which the cultivators had held their fields, into a private and hostile record under the control of the landholders.

It took some time for either the landholders or the tenants to realise that the Government had committed so cruel and disastrous a blunder. The Board of Revenue had to urge on the change,[1] and as late as 1796 found it necessary to call for a general report as to whether the change had been carried into effect.[2] The revolution was indeed so repugnant to popular usage and feeling, that the old village patwárís themselves at first hesitated to be a party to it ; some of them gave in falsified returns,[3] while the British Collectors pointed out the defects of the system.[4] But by degrees[5] the will of the Government and the strength of the law prevailed; and the

[1] See, for example, Letters Nos. 3680 (in Bírbhúm), 3799 (in Pánchet and Jhálidá), Vol. II.

[2] Circular Letter No. 5831, June 3, 1796, Vol. II.

[3] Letters 5509, 5524, etc., Vol. II.

[4] Letter No. 5354, Vol. II.

[5] But only by slow degrees. See, for example, Letters No. 10,744, 11,014, Vol. IV. (both in 1802), etc.

village registrars who had been the hereditary guardians of the rights of the cultivators against the landholders were converted into zamindárí servants, and supporters of the claims of the landholders against the cultivators.

The process was not completed, however, without protests from the District officers, and no sooner had it been completed than the Government began to realise its mistake. The measures by which it tried in vain to remedy its blunder lie beyond the scope of this essay. The attempts to resuscitate the old village record of rights, during the first twenty years of the present century, have left their traces alike in the District archives,[1] in the Despatches of the Court of Directors,[2] and in the Bengal legislation of the period.[3] 'All inquiries into the state of landed rights and tenures,' wrote the Court of Directors, 'will be greatly facilitated by the re-organisation of the offices of kánúngo and patwárí on their ancient footing, which we recommended in our despatches of the 29th January 1813, 28th October 1814, and 6th January 1815.'[4] This long series of instructions received legislative expression in Regulation I. of 1819, which directed the re-establishment of kánúngos throughout Bengal, and defined the duties of the patwárís.

But all such attempts to put back the hand on the dial failed. The old record of rural rights had been

[1] For example, Letters Nos. 12,369–70, 12,818, Vol. IV. Interesting information on the subject, particularly with reference to the kánúngos, will be found in the *Selections from the Duncan Records* (1787–1795); *e.g.* pp. 40, 52, 114, 208, and Appendix E (Benares, 1873).

[2] For example, Revenue Letter to Bengal, dated October 28, 1814, already quoted.

[3] For the subsequent Patwárí legislation to 1819, see Regulation VII. of 1799, V. of 1800 (Benares), XII. and XIII. of 1817, I. of 1818, and I. of 1819.

[4] Revenue Letter to Bengal, dated January 15, 1819, para. 69.—*Selections, East India House*, p. 363, Folio i., 1820.

hopelessly destroyed, and the Bengal cultivators were for half a century left almost at the mercy of competitive rents, with 'an obviously empty injunction on the zamíndár amicably to adjust and consolidate the amount of his claims.'[1] It was reserved for the great catena of Agrarian Laws, inaugurated by Act X. of 1859, to develop a legislative system of land tenures out of the relics of the ancient land customs. But even that system had in the end to call in the aid of a local inquiry and a local record of rights, that is to say, of an authoritative register of rents and holdings.[2] Before 1815 the disastrous effects of turning the old village registrars into zamindárí servants had been clearly recognised. But a proposal then put forward to make them joint servants of the zamíndár and the village community yielded no practical result.[3]

The mistake made by Lord Cornwallis, although disastrous, is easily explained. He, and those of his colleagues whom he carried with him, underrated the difficulties of the inquiry involved.[4] They desired to

[1] Revenue Minute by Lord Moira, dated Sept. 21, 1815, para. 141.

[2] See Chapter X. of the Bengal Tenancy Act (VIII.) of 1885.

[3] Report by Mr. Thomas Sisson to the Secretary to the Government, dated April 2, 1815, para. 40.

[4] As a member of the Select Committee on the Bengal Tenancy Act of 1885, I may mention that, with every desire on the part of the members to simplify the requirements of the law, it was found impossible to reduce the particulars in the cultivators' record of rights below the following eight items. They represented an amount of information which it was impossible for the District officers of Bengal, whether in 1793 or in 1885, to obtain without careful inquiry and measurement, field by field. (*a*) 'The name of each tenant. (*b*) The class to which he belongs, that is to say, whether he is a tenure-holder, ráiyat holding at fixed rates, occupancy-ráiyat, non-occupancy ráiyat or under-ráiyat; and if he is a tenure-holder, whether he is a permanent tenure-holder or not, and whether his rent is liable to enhancement during the continuance of his tenure. (*c*) The situation, quantity, and

stitute a uniform and simple title for the complex nditions under which the cultivator held his land; and ey tried to reach this result by a short cut. Every dholder was to give every tenant a declaratory lease, ting the exact amount of his rent; that amount was to exceed the established parganá rates for the crops wn on it; it was not to be raised except on the und that the cultivator changed his crops to more uable ones; nor was the cultivator to be any longer ponsible for making good the rent of other resident ats who had died or deserted their lands. The crux , What were the established rates? John Shore had down the method for fixing them, village by village, ughout an estate. But, characteristically enough, in *Plan for the Ease and Security of the Ráiyats*, the nber of years in which the process was to be accomhed was left blank in 1789, and it does not appear to e been ever filled in.[1] Even if the landholders had n desirous of carrying out the orders of the Governt, for the introduction of a general system of declara- leases, they had not the fundamental data necessary he purpose.

The system, moreover, involved a counterpart ement[2] by the cultivator, declaring that he held the

aries of the land held by him. (*d*) The name of his landlord. (*e*) The ayable. (*f*) The mode in which that rent has been fixed, whether by ct, by order of a Court, or otherwise. (*g*) If the rent is a gradually sing rent, the time at which, and the steps by which it increases. e special conditions and incidents, if any, of the tenancy.'—Act VIII. 5, section 102, clause 2.

See *ante*, p. 70. In the Fifth Report of the Select Committee of the of Commons, 1810, the document is reproduced in full, with a space nk for the number of years, and the words '*sic in orig.*' as a marginal Madras Reprint, vol. i. p. 210.

The *Kabúliyat*.

lands at the rent specified in the lease. Whether the landholders were or were not desirous of granting the leases, it is certain that the cultivators were unwilling to execute such counterparts. They had good grounds for this reluctance. In the first place, they were quite content with their old title under the village record of rights. In the second place, they were vaguely apprehensive lest the proposed lease and counterpart should somehow alter their status for the worse, or subject them to new obligations. This apprehension has been, perhaps too comprehensively, formulated into the statement that the resident ráiyats 'refused *pattas* from the zamíndárs lest they should be regarded thereby as tenants holding from the zamíndárs.'[1] In the third place, the cultivators as a rule held more land than they were rated for in the village registrars, and they shrank from an inquiry into the exact amount. I have already referred to this aspect of the case,[2] and the MS. Letters now summarised prove that it was a very serious aspect.

Many of the Bengal zamíndárs would have been too glad of an opportunity to measure their cultivators' holdings under the sanction of Government; and, indeed, the mere threat of such a measurement would have enabled most of them to levy a good round sum from their tenants by way of peace-offering. On the introduction of the Decennial Settlement, some of the landholders came forward with applications for authority to measure, with a view to enabling them to issue leases.[3]

[1] *The Zemindary Settlement of Bengal*, vol. i. p. 16. Calcutta, 1879.

[2] *Ante*, p. 61.

[3] For example, the Rájá of the great zamíndárí of Rájsháhí. Letter No. 2534 (Dec. 7, 1792), Vol. I., conveys the Governor-General's sanction to such a proposal.

It is doubtful whether, under the old record of rights, an ordinary zamíndár could have raised the rent above the amount specified in the village register, by entering upon and measuring up the lands of the resident cultivators, unless expressly authorised by the Government. A powerful landholder might have been able to carry through such an operation. But it would have been generally condemned as a high-handed measure.[1]

The fourth objection of the cultivators to substitute a title by lease and counterpart agreement for their title under the village record of rights, rested on still stronger grounds. The lease was to adopt the established parganá rates as the rent, and to perpetuate those rates for ever. But we have seen[2] that, owing to the depletion of the population by the famine of 1770, these established parganá rates were considerably in excess of the economic rent or actual market-value of the land. One-third of the cultivable area of Bengal lay untilled, and a great agrarian struggle was going on with a view to bringing down the customary rates paid by the resident ráiyats to something nearer the economic rent paid by the vagrant cultivators. This struggle I have clearly explained in Chapter III. of the present essay, and in my *Annals of Rural Bengal*. By a general acceptance of leases and execution of the counterpart agreements,[3] the resident tenants would have declared themselves defeated, and stereotyped for ever the customary rates, to avoid which they had even been willing to abandon their hereditary homesteads.

[1] *Zulm*, oppression, a word which in Bengal had a special application to unjust or excessive assessments.—H. H. Wilson's *Glossary*, p. 568, 4to edition, 1855.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 62–65.

[3] *Kabúliyats*.

A similar reluctance to receive leases and execute counterpart agreements was disclosed in the Province of Benares, which lay just outside the area of the severest scarcity in 1770. We find the British Resident complaining in 1788 'that the ráiyats in general would not accept the *pattas*' except at a reduction of rent.[1] They alleged poverty as an excuse; but the truth is that both in Bengal and in the bordering Districts, the twenty years following 1770 were a period of falling rents, and the effect of the Permanent Settlement leases would have been to arrest the natural readjustment of rates.

A similar attempt had been made more than once during that period,[2] and had on each occasion broken down. In 1776, Warren Hastings recorded that not only had the design of establishing new leases for the cultivators failed, both under the previous administration and under his own, but that it would continue to fail, unless some more rigid means were taken to enforce it.[3] He modestly disclaims 'the spirit of prophecy.' But even the prophetic gift could scarcely have enabled him to foresee that, only seventeen years later, his successor would make the welfare of Bengal population depend on a system of leases, and would at the same time destroy the machinery of rural registers by which alone such a system could be constructed.

All the four objections which I have enumerated, existed at the time of the Permanent Settlement, and they were sufficient in themselves to render the resident

[1] Proceedings of the Resident, dated 25th July 1788.—*Selections from the Duncan Records*, p. 14. Benares, 1873.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 67, 68.

[3] Minute by the Governor-General, dated 1st Nov. 1776.—*Selections from the Records at the East India House*, Folio i. of 1820, p. 436.

cultivators extremely reluctant to accept leases or to execute the counterpart agreements. But under the Permanent Settlement two new obstacles were created. The first of these had reference to the compulsory powers granted to the landholders to enable them to force leases on the cultivators. If the tenants did not come in and accept leases, the zamíndár was empowered[1] to post up in his land office a list of rates, and, after offering to give leases at those rates, to recover his rent at the said rates by civil suit or distraint of the crops, whether the cultivators had agreed to the rates or not. It is not surprising that the cultivators regarded such a system as an engine of oppression placed in the hands of the landlords, and kept aloof from it.

In the second place, as an auction sale of an estate for arrears of revenue cleared all encumbrances,[2] and as the zamíndár could at any time bring about such a sale by a fictitious default, the value of a lease seemed extremely doubtful. The object of this regulation was to defeat fraudulent conveyances of revenue-bearing lands, and a cultivator had the right to get his lease renewed at the established parganá rates. But this would have involved a fresh attendance at the zamíndár's land office, and a new set of bribes to his underlings. In any case, the longest period for which a lease could be given was limited to ten years.[3] At the end of that term its renewal involved another series of vexations to the cultivator—and a fresh set of bribes and squeezes were wrung out of him by the zamíndárs and their servants.

[1] By Regulation IV. of 1794. [2] Regulation L. of 1795, section 5.

[3] Regulation XLIV. of 1793, section 2; Regulation L. of 1795, section 2; Regulation XLVII. of 1803, section 2, all rescinded by V. of 1812.

In brief, the leases which the Permanent Settlement tried to substitute for the village record of rights were leases which could be forced on the tenant by the landholder, in some cases even without his knowledge or against his will. They were leases which could be voided at any time by the landholder, under the operation of the Revenue Sale Laws. They were leases which in no case could run for more than ten years. In addition, therefore, to the four objections which the cultivators had in accepting leases before 1793,[1] the Permanent Settlement gave to such leases an arbitrary, an uncertain, and a temporary character, which would have seriously impaired any value which they might otherwise have possessed.

The attempt to supplant the cultivators' old title as recorded in the village register by so imperfect a system of leases, completely failed. In 1793, indeed, Lord Cornwallis sounded a premature note of triumph,[2] probably encouraged by the circumstance that in the immediate neighbourhood of Calcutta the process of introducing leases had been going on for some time.[3] But after a year's experience the Bengal Government became uneasy about the success of the experiment, and tried to force on the change by making the tender of leases by the landholders equivalent to the acceptance by the tenants.[4] This oppressive law only made the system more unpopular. In 1799 we still find the Board

[1] *Ante*, pp. 125, 126.

[2] Despatch to the Court of Directors, dated 6th March 1793.

[3] In the District of the Twenty-four Parganás, where the population most rapidly recovered its numbers after the famine of 1770, and where leases had therefore become desirable to the cultivators. They are referred to as early as 1786, in the Letters now summarised, *e.g.* No. 1168.

[4] Regulation IV. of 1794.

of Revenue issuing further instructions, 'which the Board hopes will tend to give greater effect to the Regulation regarding the distribution of leases.'[1] Those difficulties do not seem to have been brought before the Select Committee of 1810, which accordingly thought it 'probable that the expectations of the Government have been fulfilled, as no new Regulation yet appears, altering or rescinding the one alluded to,' that is, Regulation VIII. of 1793.

But fresh legislation was immediately impending. In 1812 the ten years' limit on leases was abolished, and the landholders were 'declared competent to grant leases for any period which they may deem most convenient to themselves and tenants.'[2] Again too late! By that time the landholders as well as the tenants were arrayed against a system of leases which experience had proved to be useless for protection, although capable of being used as an instrument of menace and extortion.

'The Regulations have now been printed and published since 1793, a period of eighteen years,' wrote a plain-spoken District officer in 1811,[3] 'and I am convinced, notwithstanding the wish of the Government, that *pattas* should be granted and *kabúliyats* taken; there are as few now as ever there were. It will naturally be asked, how does this happen? The only explanation I can offer is, that the rights of the ráiyats have never been determined; or, if determined, not well understood. The consequence is, the zamíndár, who

[1] Letter No. 7886, Vol. III.

[2] Regulation V. of 1812, section 2; modified by Regulations XIV. and XVIII. of the same year.

[3] Mr. E. Barnett, Acting Collector of Rájsháhí, dated 16th Aug. 1811, para. 11, to the Board of Revenue. The latter is given in full in *Selections from the Records at the East India House*, Folio i. pp. 239–243.

pretends to consider his ráiyat a tenant-at-will, tenders a *patta* at an exorbitant rate; the ráiyat, who considers himself (from the circumstance of having held his lands for a very long period) a species of *mukararrídár*,[1] conceives that he is entitled to hold his lands at a fixed rent, and therefore refuses the *patta;* the zamíndár distrains, and the ráiyat is ruined.'

That this state of things had resulted not in one District alone, but throughout the whole Provinces subjected to the Permanent Settlement, is established by many contemporary documents. Quotations from three of them must here suffice. In 1815, Lord Moira recorded[2] how the complaints of the village tenure-holders 'have crowded in upon me without number; and I had only the mortification of finding that the existing system, established by the Legislature, left me without the means of pointing out to the complainants any mode in which they might hope to obtain redress.'[3] 'The under-proprietors,' he elsewhere says, referring to the body of resident cultivators, 'were considered to have no rights, except such as might be conferred by *patta*,' although their right rested on 'a custom more ancient than all law.'[4] 'This indefeasible right,' he goes on to say, 'was annihilated by our directing that *pattas*

[1] That is, a hereditary tenure-holder, paying at rates not legally susceptible of increase.

[2] Governor-General's Minute, dated the 21st Sept. 1815, a State paper of great insight and historical importance, which occupies over thirty-two folio pages in the *Selections from the Records at the East India House*, pp. 403–435, 1820.

[3] *Idem*, para. 139. Lord Moira regarded the resident cultivators as 'village zamíndárs,' as distinguished from the superior zamíndárs with whom the Permanent Settlement had been made in 1793.

[4] *Idem*, paras. 141, 142.

should be executed for a money payment.'[1] 'The under-proprietor was thus left to the mercy of the zamíndár, to whose demands there were no prescribed limits.[2] The zamíndár offered a *patta* on his own terms. If the under-proprietor[3] refused it, he was ejected, and the Courts supported the ejectment . . . because it was proved that the *patta* was offered and refused, and there was no criterion to which he could refer, as a means of proving that the rate was exorbitant.'

By 1815 the delusive character of the title provided for the cultivators by the leases under the Permanent Settlement had been found out. The cultivators, wrote an experienced officer in that year, have always sought 'to avoid the taking of such *pattas*, under the impression that they would thereby be compromising their right to unlimited occupancy.'[4] But by that time it was also discovered that unless the cultivator took out a lease, he was apt to sink into a mere tenant-at-will. The increase in the population had, as we have seen, led to a great rise in economic rents.[5] How was the hereditary cultivator to resist that rise? The old machinery of District and village registers, which formed his record of rights, had been destroyed.

[1] Revenue Minute by Lord Moira, dated 21st Sept. 1815, para. 143.

[2] Except, of course, the parganá rates, which had never been ascertained, and the machinery for ascertaining which had been destroyed by the Permanent Settlement, *ante*, pp. 118–122.

[3] That is, the resident cultivator.

[4] Report by Mr. Thomas Sisson, late joint-magistrate of Rangpur, dated 2nd April 1815.—*Selections of Records at the East India House*, p. 388, Folio i., 1820. This elaborate account of the relations of the landed classes in 1815, is dated from Bencoolen, and was probably written by Mr. Sisson, while on sick-leave.

[5] *Ante*, p. 109.

Whither, then, could he turn for legal proof of his claim to continue to occupy his fields at the old 'established rate'? The kánúngos, or registrars of fiscal divisions and Districts, had been abolished a score of years. If, says Mr. Sisson,[1] the cultivators call in the aid of the village headman, the latter has no evidence to produce, and is 'in nine cases out of ten bribed to the interest of the zamíndár.' 'Let them go to their patwárí [the village registrar]; he is in the regular pay of the zamíndár, and is removable from office at his pleasure. From him, therefore, they will collect nothing favourable. Let them go to the munsif [the rural judge]; here they not infrequently find as much ignorance as before, and always as much collusion in favour of the opposite party.'

The hereditary cultivators were beginning to learn that they had no status in the eye of the law, except such as they might derive from the very leases which they had so long declined to accept. Yet they continued to cling to their old conviction that the right of occupancy at the old-established rates was theirs by indefeasible custom, and would only be weakened by any transactions in writing with the landholder. 'A person connected with the property in the soil,' wrote Sir Edward Colebrooke four years later,[2] 'will never accept a *patta* from the nominal zamíndár, or persons under engagements with Government. He holds his land and regulates his payments by a much more solid tenure, and would consider himself as departing from his rights, by the acceptance of a document tending to

[1] Report of 2nd April 1815, para. 18.

[2] *Selections from the Records at the East India House*, 5th January 1819, Revenue Series, Folio iii. pp. 171, 172.

convert him from a *málik* to an *asámí*:' *i.e.* from 'a cultivator possessing a hereditary or proprietary right in the land he cultivates,'[1] to 'a renter, a non-proprietary cultivator.'[2]

At this point of time, my review must for the present close. I have already brought it to a period beyond that to which the four volumes of correspondence now summarised come down (1807), and even beyond that to which I have personally examined the Manuscript Records (1812). But in order to bring out the results of the attempt to suddenly substitute a title by lease for the old title under the village record of rights, it was necessary to deal as a whole with the thirty years following the Decennial Settlement of 1789. Economic causes had come into play during this period, which rendered the results more disastrous to the cultivators than it was possible for Lord Cornwallis and the Court of Directors to anticipate, when, in 1793, they declared that Settlement permanent. But they forgot that it is the unforeseen which usually happens when foreign rulers impose a new system of their own upon so conservative a people as the cultivators of Bengal. Their error was, that in their haste after finality they deprived their successors of that power of readjustment and revision, which their most experienced advisers declared essential to the success of the change.

The increase in the population had, during the thirty years, revolutionised the relations of labour to land. In 1789, the landlords were competing for tenants;[3] in 1819, the husbandmen were competing for holdings. In 1789, the established parganá rates pay-

[1] H. A. Wilson's *Glossary*, p. 325, 4to edition, 1855.

[2] *Idem*, p. 35.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 51, 62.

able by the resident cultivators were higher than those at which outsiders, the 'vagrant cultivators,' could obtain land.[1] In 1819, the economic rent which could be obtained from outsiders was higher than the established rates at which the resident cultivators claimed to hold. In 1789, the right of occupancy at the established rates involved a pecuniary loss to the tenant;[2] by 1819 it had become a pecuniary gain. In short, the village record of rights, which in 1789 was a record of burdens,[3] had been transmuted before 1819 into a charter of privileges. It was the only safeguard which the hereditary cultivators had against the increase of their rents, and this safeguard, as I have shown, the Regulations of 1793 had seriously impaired, if not altogether destroyed.

At the time, it seemed that the provisions in the Permanent Settlement for the protection of the tenants had, in Mr. Colebrooke's words, proved 'wholly nugatory,' and that the position of the cultivators, as Lord Moira declared, was become 'desperate.'[4] We now see that the long litigation which followed was in reality a struggle for the unearned increment in Bengal. The value of the produce of the land and the economic rent value had risen above the customary rates, and the question was whether the landlord or the tenant was to profit by the change? This rise amounted, as we have seen, to one-third as early as 1812. In 1876–77, the landlord's rental was officially estimated to be thirty times greater than the sum which was assumed at the Permanent Settlement in 1793. That Settlement allowed

[1] *Ante*, pp. 52, 62. [2] *Ante*, pp. 57, 60, 63. [3] *Ante*, p. 65.

[4] Both of these expressions are quoted with approval in the Court of Directors' Despatch of the 15th January 1819.

as rental or income the zamíndárs' one-tenth of the land revenue,[1] or Rs. 2,858,772. The rental was valued in 1876–77, for substantially the same area,[2] at Rs. 121,974,031,[3] excluding the separate profits on sub-tenures; while the land revenue from the same area was Rs. 33,920,376.[4] This would leave a balance, Rs. 88,053,655, as rental to the landlords, or thirty times their assumed income from the land in 1793.

It will be observed that I put this calculation in the hypothetical mood, for it depends on several assumptions; and the most that can be said of it is that, in the opinion of impartial and trustworthy authorities, it understates rather than overestimates the rental now derived from the land. Mr. Chapman, for long Secretary of the Board of Revenue, declared it as his opinion in 1868, 'that the proprietors of land in Bengal divide among them a profit of at least £10,000,000 a year.' But he also held that this vast increment was distributed among a great variety of tenure-holders, from the cultivator 'with a right of occupancy, who, it is probable, ordinarily does in practice enjoy some beneficiary interest, to the Rájá of Bardwan and the Rájá of Darbhanga,'[5] two of the great territorial magnates in Bengal.

Into the fifty years' war over this increment, the landholders entered with a well-defined title, the tenants with a 'wholly nugatory' one. That the latter did not

[1] For Bengal, Behar, and 'Orissa' (excluding the Cuttack Division, see *ante*, p. 107), Sicca rupees, 26,800,989, or Current Rupees, 28,587,722. One-tenth = Rs. 2,858,772.

[2] *I.e.* excluding the modern Orissa, also Haráribágh, Mánbhúm, and Lohardagga.

[3] Bengal Administration Report for 1876–77.

[4] *Idem.*

[5] Memorandum by Mr. R. B. Chapman, Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L. P., dated 3rd June 1868.

fare worse, indeed, that they were not altogether crushed in the struggle, is due to four causes. In the first place, the Bengal authorities and the Court of Directors discovered at an early period the inadequacy of the Permanent Settlement to protect the rights of the tenants. This recognition was definitely acted on by the Court of Directors in their despatch of the 15th January 1819, to the Government of Bengal, directing its attention 'to the state of insecurity and oppression in which the great mass of the cultivators are placed.' From that time onward, and, in fact, for several years before 1819, the Bengal Government laboured indirectly to mitigate the evils which the too hasty legislation of 1793 had brought about. It fought on the side of the cultivators, but it fought with its hands tied by the Permanent Settlement.

In the second place, the Courts of Justice, and especially the Superior Courts, gradually arrayed themselves on the same side. The grounds of their decisions were uncertain, conflicting, and at times, as it now seems to us, scarcely defensible. But they did, on the whole, make some allowance for the unwritten customs and status of the cultivators, often in the teeth of a mass of sworn evidence which they calmly, and perhaps on good grounds, ignored. In the third place, the cultivators developed a power for combined resistance, which often proved ruinous to a too stringent landlord. Even if a landholder had the law in his favour, it was costly to invoke its aid, and difficult to enforce its decrees, among a hostile tenantry whose holdings did not average ten acres a piece. Fifty rent suits are a serious undertaking for an enhancing landlord. But five hundred or even a thousand suits against a population

of cultivators resolutely combined to resist them, and armed with all the weapons of defence, or of delay, which their underhand transfers[1] and the Hindu joint family system placed in their hands,—that was the task which lay before a grasping landlord in Bengal, and one which he did not always find it convenient to carry to the bitter end.

In the fourth place, if there were many grasping landholders, there were also many lenient ones. An immediate effect of the Permanent Settlement was, as we have seen, to bring a large proportion of the old estates to sale for arrears of revenue; and new landlords are proverbially strict ones. But the sons and grandsons of these new men developed into rural magnates, —easy-going, not to say indolent, of a gentle self-indulgence which was not altogether self-centred, and anxious to have the esteem and good-word of their people. They knew well that an enhancing landlord was a hated one, and they also knew that the unwritten usage of the country was in favour of occupancy rights at fixed rates. Custom wielded its silent influence over the landlords as well as over the tenants of Bengal.

When, at length, the Bengal Government tardily resolved in 1859 to put the position of the cultivators on a definite legislative basis, it was found that a large body of them still retained occupancy rights. The truth is, that many of the Bengal landholders had never pushed their claims to extremities. They had taken occasional squeezes, such as the Indian cultivator has always regarded as his fate. But they had not carried out a systematic or wholesale destruction of tenant right. Considering the utter failure of the Permanent Settle-

[1] *Benámí*, transfers.

ment of 1793 to protect the cultivators, and the confused decisions of the law-courts during the next half century, the infrequency of rural disturbances is honourable alike to the landlords and tenants in Bengal. They worked out for themselves a *modus vivendi* from a legislative blunder, which might have led to agrarian anarchy among a less self-controlled or a less forbearing people. The series of land laws since 1859 has at length given legal force to the customary rights of the cultivators; the rights which the Permanent Settlement of 1793 acknowledged but left unascertained.

In accomplishing this object, the Legislature has had to readjust those rights to the economic conditions of modern Bengal. The hereditary or occupancy tenures of the past are conserved. Provision is made by law for the further development of hereditary or occupancy tenures in the future. A practical, although not altogether satisfactory, basis has been created for the division of the unearned increment between landlord and tenant, by means of judicially fixed rents. A legislative scheme has been framed for a rural record of rights.

# INDEX TO BENGAL RECORDS.

## JANUARY, 1782.

1. Petition from Gharib-Ullá-Názír, applying for house rent for persons confined. January 3.
2. Petition from Zamíndár of Amrábád, applying for a division of the Zamíndárí. January 3.
3. Petition from Farmer of Parganá Maihátí, complaining of the Zamíndár. January 11.
4. Petition from Zamíndárs of Maimansinh and Alap Sinh, respecting the disturbances of the Sanyásís (or beggar-bands of robbers). January 30.
5. Petition from Zamíndár of Bardákhát, requesting a Batwárá (or division of the estate among the members of the family). January 30.
6. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, respecting the claims of private persons to pieces of ground in the vicinity of Monghir. January 24.
7. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, transmitting account for the Puls (embankments). January 28.
8. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, transmitting copy of a complaint from Akbar Alí. January 7.
9. Letter to Chief of Dacca, informing him that the Collector of Silhet is rendered independent of him. January 3.
10. Letter from Chief of Dacca, respecting the Jágír lands in Parganá Bháwal. January 17.
11. Letter to Chief of Dacca, directing him to furnish particulars of the remissions and deductions of the native year 1186. January 21.
12. Letter from Díwán, with orders to despatch boats for treasure from Midnapur, and orders respecting the Zamíndár of Bardákhát. January 11.
13. Letter from Díwán, reporting on a petition from the Farmer of Chandradwíp. January 17.

14. Letter to Governor-General and Council, respecting the Ramná lands of Rájsháhí. January 7. [Ramná lands were properly a park or preserve for game, also used as grazing lands.]
15. Letter from Governor-General, etc., replying to the Committee's letters of 13th, 20th, and 31st December. January 7.
16. Letter to Governor-General, etc., transmitting treasury account and account of charges in November. January 11.
17. Letter to Governor-General, etc., with sundry papers relative to Mr. Keble's undertaking (a canal. See subsequent entries). January 11.
18. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing copy of a letter from Lieut. Kinloch in Rájsháhí. January 11.
19. Letter to Governor-General, etc., accompanying proceedings for December. January 14.
20. Letter to Governor-General, etc., recommending an Establishment for the Collector of Silhet. January 14.
21. Letter to Governor-General, etc., with Colonel Watson's proposals for purchase of Dutch opium. January 14.
22. Letter from Governor-General, etc., granting the Senior Commissioner of Customs the rank of President. January 17.
23. Letter to Governor-General, etc., on the subject of the Tipperah Province. January 24.
24. Letter to Governor-General, etc., with copy of a letter to Colonel Ironside, respecting Madgerud Sháh (a famous leader of the Sanyásís or banditti). January 26.
25. Letter to Governor-General, etc., forwarding copies of correspondence with the resident at Tipperah. January 28.
26. Letter to Governor-General, etc., forwarding list of Thánás (police divisions) to be established in Purniah. January 28.
27. Letter from Governor-General, etc., forwarding copy of a letter from Collector of Midnapur, respecting the Jungle Zamíndárs. January 30.
28. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing petition from the Zamíndárs of Maimansinh and Alap Sinh. January 30.
29. Letter to Collector of Húglí, transmitting copy of the Amín's Report who examined the ground for Major Tolly's Canal. January 7.
30. Letter to Colonel Ironside, commanding at Barhampur, respecting the incursions of Sháh Madgerud (leader of the beggar-banditti) in Rájsháhí. January 24.

31. Order (Parwáná) to Farmer of Susang, to give up certain Brahmottar Lands, *i.e.* lands dedicated to religious uses, to the Zamíndár. January 11.
32. Order (Parwáná) to Zamíndárs of Murshidábád, to permit the Elephant contractor's people to cut grass. January 30.
33. Letter from Chief of Purniah, replying to letter of 3rd December, and enclosing a petition from the Farmer. January 7.
34. Letter to Chief of Purniah, respecting Madgerud Sháh (the chief of the beggar-banditti). January 7.
35. Letter to Preparer of Reports, with orders respecting the Tálukdár of Mohanbátí in Rájsháhí. January 7.
36. Letter to Preparer of Reports, forwarding him, for report, petition from the Vakíl of Susang. January 28.
37. Letter from Commander of the Murshidábád Militia, requesting the Committee to apply to the Commanding-officer at Barhampur for a force, if needful, to oppose the Sanyásís. January 14.
38. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting respecting Bardákhát, and with information on a petition from the Zamíndár of Bishnupur. January 11.
39. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting on the balance in the treasury. January 14.
40. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting on the application of Mr. Keble for sundry Parwánás, along with his minute on a petition from Biswa Nath Dás. January 24.
41. Letter from Mr. John Shore, informing the Committee that he has given directions for the sale of the Dutch opium. January 28.
42. Letter from Mr. John Shore, with his report, accompanying petitions from the Farmer of Rájsháhí, and intimating that he has written to the Nawab regarding a complaint from the Farmers of Rájsháhí. January 28.
43. Letter to Collector of Silhet, directing him to take charge of the collections, and to dispossess the Farmer. January 3.
44. Letter from Resident at Tipperah, regarding the incapability of the District to complete the payment of the Settlement. January 21.
45. Letter from Resident at Tipperah, reporting the appearance of hostile intentions on the part of the Rájá. January 28.
46. Letter to Resident at Tipperah, informing him that the Honourable Board have ordered the Province to be let in Farm. January 30.
47. Letter from Mr. H. Vansittart, comptroller of the Salt Office,

transmitting copy of a complaint against the Rájá of Nadiyá for extortionate collection of dues. January 11.

48. Letter to Mr. H. Vansittart, accompanying a report from the agent at Tamluk, respecting Mr. Keble's undertaking. January 11.

49. Letter to Mr. H. Vansittart, transmitting to him a copy of letter to the Board, and proceedings relating to Mr. Keble's grant. January 24.

50. Letter from Colonel Henry Watson, containing proposals for the purchase of the Opium allotted to the Dutch. January 14.

## FEBRUARY, 1782.

51. Petition from the Farmer of Silhet, on the loss of his Farm. February 8.

52. Petition from Nandalál Rái, respecting disturbances in Parganá Amrol. February 18.

53. Petitions (2) from Zamíndár of Roshanábád in justification of his conduct. February 25.

54. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, reporting his having repaid the Zamíndárs the amount of their loan to Government. February 18.

55. Letter from Mr. J. Bayne, enclosing articles of agreement to be entered into by the Rájá of Bardwán for the repair of the Deori Puls (embankment). February 14.

56. Letter from Company's Attorney, applying for proceedings to enable him to draw up a grant to Mr. Keble. February 6.

57. Letter to Company's Attorney, furnishing him with a copy of the Committee's resolutions respecting Mr. Keble's grant. February 25.

58. Letter from Company's Attorney, requesting to be authorized to put in bail for the appearance of the Zamíndár of Pánchet (or Páchet in W. of Bírbhúm and Bánkurá). February 8. Not granted.

59. Letter from Mr. John Crees, on the subject of the disturbances in Bhuluá and Lakhmípur (in S.E. of Bengal). February 14.

60. Letter to Chief of Dacca, directing him to furnish Sepoys for the protection of Maimansinh. February 14.

61. Letter from Chief of Dacca, transmitting amount of deductions on the Settlement of Bengal, year 1186. February 18.

62. Letter from Díwán, reporting on the petition of the Farmer of the Nánkár sloop Mahal. February 14.
63. Letter from Díwán, reporting on the Battá (or Exchange) on different species of Rupees. February 18.
64. Letter from Governor-General and Council, appointing Mr. Fenwick chief of Murshidábád. February 14.
65. Letter from Governor-General, etc., approving of the Thánás (police division) proposed to be erected in Purniah, directing the Committee to furnish Sepoys for the protection of Maimansinh; replying to the Committee's report respecting the Jungle Zamíndár of Midnapur being made Huzúrí, etc. February 14.
66. Letter to Governor-General, etc., accompanying accounts explaining the balances in arrears on the Settlement of Bengal, year 1187. February 25.
67. Letter to Governor-General, etc., respecting the disposition of the Militia Sepoys. February 28.
68. Letter from Collector of Húglí, transmitting account of balances for Bengal, year 1186. February 6.
69. Letter to Lieutenant Kinloch, commanding in Nátor, respecting disturbances of the rayats (husbandmen) in Parganá Amrol. February 18.
70. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, reporting that the Farmer of Dinájpur has paid 100,000 rupees into his treasury. February 14.
71. General orders to the several chiefs and collectors, transmitting printed copy of the regulations for justice. February 6.
72. Order (Parwáná) to the Zamíndár of Nadiyá, on his having fallen into arrears. February 6.
73. Order (Parwáná) to sundry Zamíndárs in Bhuluá and Lakhmípur, on a representation of their bad conduct. February 14.
74. Order (Parwáná) to the Farmer of Rájsháhí, to deliver up the rayats (husbandmen) of Ghorághát. February 28.
75. Letter from Preparer of Reports, respecting the Sháhjahánpur cause. February 6. Orders sent thereon.
76. Letter from Preparer of Reports, on the regulations respecting Opium. February 14. Orders thereon.
77. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, reporting the remissions granted on settlement of 1186. February 14.
78. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, with an account of balances due from rayats who have fled into Rájsháhí. February 28.

79. Letter from Mr. John Shore, with report relative to Mr. Keble's Canal. February 25.

80. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting on two petitions from the Zamíndárs of Roshanábád. February 25.

81. Letter from Resident at Tipperah, reporting that the nephews of the Rájá seem resolved to oppose Government with an armed force. February 25.

82. Letter from Mr. H. Vansittart, comptroller of the Salt Office, on the subject of the disturbances in Parganás Bhuluá and Lakhmípur. February 14.

## MARCH, 1782.

83. Petition from Sazáwal of Bishnupur, requesting that the Sazáwal of Bardwán may be ordered to give up the rayats of Bishnupur. March 4.

84. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, directing him to remit the revenue of his District to the Resident at the Darbár. March 14.

85. Letter from Mr. S. Charteris, together with papers and accounts relative to the settlement of Súbah Behar. March 7.

86. Letter from Chief of Dacca, reporting his having confined the Farmer of Susang (in Maimansinh). March 11.

87. Letter to Díwán, ordering him to prepare a statement of the revenue derived by Government from the sale of spirituous liquors. March 4.

88. Letter to Mr. John Evelyn, Collector of Calcutta, enclosing a general Parwáná (order) to be circulated throughout Rájsháhi, forbidding any anticipation of the revenue. March 25.

89. Letter to Governor-General and Council, enclosing a Table of Toll Fees for Mr. Keble's Canal. March 11.

90. Letter from Governor-General, etc., reporting that a Sanad (grant) has been ordered for Rájá Kalián Sinh. March 25.

91. Letter from Governor-General, etc., authorizing the plan proposed by the Collector of Bhágalpur respecting the granting of Pattás; directing that severity be used for the recovery of the arrears of 1187, and directing to bring to immediate punishment all persons proved to be guilty of resistance to the Committee's orders. March 25.

92. Letter from Governor-General, etc., approving of Toll Rates for Mr. Keble's Canal. March 25.

93. Letter to Governor-General, etc., reporting on the claims of the Rájá of Morbhanj (in N. of Orissa). March 28.

94. Letter to Collector of Pánchet (W. of Bánkurá), directing him to proceed to Bishnupur to inquire into the reason of the failure of the revenues. March 11.

95. Order (Parwáná) to Sazáwal of Bardwán, directing him to assign his reasons for not advancing the pay of the Rájá's household troops. March 4.

96. Order (Parwáná) to Sazáwal of Bishnupur, directing him to apply to Sazáwal of Bardwán for the rayats (cultivators) who may have taken refuge there. March 4.

97. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, stating his intention of proceeding to Kharakdiá to inquire into the extent of the losses occasioned by the disturbances of Akbal Alí Khán. March 7.

98. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, reporting on the state of the district of Kharakdiá. March 25.

99. Letter from Mr. J. Shore, reporting places where the interposition of the Committee is necessary; reporting the orders issued by the Governor-General respecting the Ramná lands (hunting and grazing lands), and laying before the Committee an account of the sales of opium. March 25.

100. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting that he has dispossessed the Zamíndár of Nadiyá from charge of the collections. March 25.

101. Letter to Mr. H. Vansittart, enclosing copy of a letter from Mr. Keble, stating that other canals are being opened to his prejudice. March 14.

## APRIL, 1782.

102. Petition from the Agent (Vakíl) of the Zamíndár of Idrakpur, complaining of the violence and oppression which the Zamíndár suffers from Rájá Debí Sinh, and requesting redress. April 11.

103. Petition from Rayats of Dinájpur, complaining against Rájá Debí Sinh. April 24.

104. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, transmitting petition from Zamíndárs of Kánkjol. April 29.

105. Letter from Mr. Samuel Charteris, transmitting a representation from the renter of Sarkár Sáran, for remissions. April 26.

106. Letter to Díwán, ordering him to place four peons over the

Idrakpur Vakíl (the legal agent for the landholder of Idrakpur), till he sets off to attend Mr. Redfearn. April 24.

107. Letter to Mr. John Evelyn, Collector of Calcutta, informing him of his having been appointed a temporary Member of the Committee. April 4.

108. Letter from Governor-General and Council, with letter and petition from the Judge at Darbhángá, and directing the Zamíndár of Sarishá to be dispossessed. April 1.

109. Letter to Governor-General, etc., reporting the death of Muhammad Kamzar, proprietor of the Monghir Jágírs, and requesting orders as to whether they are to be continued to his relations or resumed. April 18.

110. Letter from Governor-General, etc., directing that Rájá Chakrapati Sinh and his Son are to be restored to the Nánkár (rent-free) villages they formerly held. April 22.

111. Letter to Governor-General, etc., with copy of letter from Resident of Tipperah, respecting the settlement of his district. April 29.

112. Letter to Chief of Patna, directing him to dispossess the Zamíndár of Maiháti in Sarishá, and to let the lands on certain conditions to any other person. April 1.

113. Letter to Mr. F. Redfearns, directing him to proceed to Rangpur, with instructions to inquire into the truth of the Zamíndár of Idrakpur's complaint against Rájá Debí Sinh. April 18.

114. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, reporting his having farmed the lands of the rebellious Ghátwáls of Kharakdiá, and apprehended Lál Mohan Maháta. April 4.

115. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, enclosing two petitions from the Ghátwáls of Kharakdiá and the nominal Rájá of those countries, with his observations thereon; also enclosing a letter from Captain Rankin, complaining of obstructions to the making of his road, by the Zamíndár of Rámgarh. April 8.

116. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh in reply, enclosing an order to the Rájá, directing him to give every assistance to Captain Rankin, and instructing the Collector to enforce obedience. April 8.

117. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting that the nephew of the Tipperah Zamíndár is in Calcutta, and proposing that he be called upon to give security for his good behaviour. April 29.

118. Letter from Collector of Silhet, reporting that the Hill People had entered his province and taken two Forts; representing the in-

sufficiency of the Military Force, and requesting he may be permitted to maintain a body of men on the same footing as the Collectors of Bhágalpur and Tipperah. April 8.

119. Letter to Collector of Silhet, in reply, authorizing the above, and allowing him to build two new mud Forts, at an expense not exceeding Rs. 2000.

120. Letter to William Taylor, directing him to make a settlement at Bírbhúm. April 29.

121. Letter from Resident at Tipperah, stating the necessity for concluding the settlement of his district. April 29.

122. Letter to Resident at Tipperah, approving his plan of settlement for his district, and enclosing an order (parwáná) to the Zamíndár. April 29.

## MAY, 1782.

123. Advertisement, offering a reward of Rs. 5000 for the apprehension of Ghulám Ashraf, on the charge of forgeries on the Khálsá Treasuries. May 2.

124. Petition from Abhay Charan Basu, Farmer of the Calcutta Bázárs, reporting that several persons have erected unauthorized Bázárs, which pay no dues, and praying that he might be allowed to collect the customary market-tolls. May 6.

125. Letter from the Amín, reporting on the complaint of the Farmer of Baitakkháná Bázár. May 9.

126. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, stating that he foresees the impossibility of completing his proposed plan, and recommending the farming of lands for which he may not be able to grant separate leases (mufassal pattás) immediately; mentioning the proposals of Ratan Chánd, for farming Rájmhal at an increased jamá (rent); and stating that if this offer is accepted, he should not be allowed to claim deductions on account of the grant of mufassal pattás (separate leases to the underholders and cultivators). May 2. Approved; with the stipulation as proposed.

127. Letter to Mr. Joseph Champion, informing him that the Honourable Board has appointed him Superintendent of the Zamíndárí Daftar, and explaining the nature of his office. May 9.

128. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, directing him to furnish the Resident at Tipperah with such military assistance as he may want. May 9.

129. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, forbidding the collection of unauthorized duties on horses by the Zamíndárs, etc., under their authority. May 20.

130. Letter to Díwán, directing that Rájá Rám Lochan's Bázár be abolished. May 27.

131. Letter from Governor-General and Council, in answer to several references respecting the disputes between the Chief of Dacca and the Judge at Bákarganj, and appointing 31st May for the Judge to be brought to a formal trial; directing that the Chief must have his proofs ready by that day, and that he be informed he has been guilty of irregularity in corresponding with the Judge, as well as in hazarding his authority and the peace of the country; and instructing him to seize the Chaudhrí of Shaistánagar, and all others who have or may resist his authority, and detain them until further orders. May 2.

132. Letter from Governor-General, etc., forbidding correspondence with the Judges of Adálat, and directing that similar orders be sent to all Officers under the Committee's authority, whether Europeans or natives. May 6.

133. Letter from Governor-General, etc., admitting the claims of the Farmer of Sarkár Sáran, on account of the incursions of Fathi Sinh; confirming the settlement of the Tipperah Province, and approving of the proposal that the jamá (rent) of lands be fixed before sale, and not increased during the purchaser's life. May 9.

134. Letter to Governor-General, etc., regarding arrangements for the liquidation of the debts of the Bardwán Rájá. May 13.

135. Letter from Collector of Húglí, transmitting petition from the Talukdárs, and requesting orders respecting the sale of the Taluks, as this was the only way in which the arrears of rent could be recovered. May 6.

136. Letter to Collector of Pánchet, transmitting directions for preventing the anticipation of the collections in Bishnupur. May 27.

137. Order (Parwáná) to Farmer of Calcutta Bázárs, authorizing him to collect the customary market dues from unauthorized Bázárs, under certain stipulations. May 6.

138. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Morbhanj, and Zamíndár of Bhelorachaur, intimating that Mr. Duncan has been appointed to settle their disputes. May 9.

139. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, intimating that in consequence of the Rájá's inattention to the Committee's order (parwáná) and disobedience to his orders, he has been obliged to confine him. May 13.

140. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh in reply, approving of what he has done, and directing that the Rájá be not released until he discharge his instalments of land revenue, and promise obedience. May 13.

141. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting on an application from Rájá Nabakrishna, for leave to advance Takávi to the rayats. May 27.

142. Letter to Resident of Tipperah, directing him not to pay the Rájá any allowance, except during his residence at Tipperah, and requiring his report on the force necessary to defend the Province. May 9.

143. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, proposing that the revenue should be remitted in kind on account of the cheapness of grain in Tirhut. May 30.

144. Letter to Mr. George Williamson, Vendor-Master to the Honourable Board, demanding payment of money due on account of sales of opium, and stating that in default thereof his conduct will be represented to the Board. May 9.

## JUNE, 1782.

145. Advertisement, respecting the regulations of the Bází Zamín Daftar. June 17.

146. Petition from Rámjí Mal, complaining of disturbances by the Sanyásís (beggar-banditti) in Maimansinh. June 3.

147. Petition from the Rájá of Nadiyá, binding himself, on the settlement of the current year being made with him, to pay up the Revenue kist by kist (instalment by instalment), together with the balance of last year, on pain of his forfeiting his Zamíndárí in case of failure on his part. June 21.

148. Petition from Balbhadra Sen, with proposals for farming Bírbhúm, Bishnupur, and Pánchet, for five years. June 21.

149. Petition from the Gumáshtá of Chandradwíp, complaining of violence and oppression committed by the Zamíndár. June 24.

150. Petition from the Chaudhrís of Parganá Idalpur, complaining of sundry acts of injustice and violence on the part of the Farmer. June 24.

151. Petition from the Vakíl (legal agent) of the Tálukdar of Mahidharpur, complaining that the Zamíndárs of Lashkarpur have frequently plundered his cultivators, etc., and praying that they may be ordered to desist from interfering with his Táluk. June 24. Zamíndárs of Lashkarpur are directed to attend the Committee.

152. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, approving of the settlement made with Ratan Chánd for Rájmahal. June 17.

153. Letter to Resident at Bhuluá, informing him that information has been received that the Sanyásís are raising disturbances in Maimainsh, and directing him to proceed to that district. June 3.

154. Circular Letter to Collectors, informing them that the Fauzdari Regulation (criminal law) is to take effect from the 1st Baisákh, 1189. June 10.

155. Circular Letter to Collectors, prohibiting any alienation of land without the sanction of Government. June 17.

156. Letter to Chief of Dacca, directing him to strike Rámnárain Tálukdár out of the rent-roll of his district, as he has applied to become Huzúrí (*i.e.* to pay his revenue direct to Government), and the Committee have granted his request. June 27.

157. Letter from Mr. John Evelyn, requesting copies of certain papers to guide him in conducting the business of Rájsháhí. June 17.

158. Letter from Governor-General and Council, approving the mode for the discharge of the Bardwán Rájá's debts, and ordering the abolition of the Tax on horses. June 6.

159. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing extract of a letter from Mr. Evelyn when at Rájsháhí, respecting the obstructions thrown in the way of the collections by the Zamíndár and her officers, and representing the necessity of having a military force, under the command of a European officer, stationed in that Province. June 18.

160. Letter from Governor-General and Council, mentioning the seizure of several parcels of ground in the Bardwán District by the Sheriff's peons, without any opposition on the part of the Officers of Government, and their being regularly advertised for sale at the Khálsá (Chief Revenue Court, Calcutta); and directing the Committee strictly to enjoin all Revenue Officers to prevent such acts from happening in future. June 21.

161. Letter to Collector of Húglí, stating that several Zamíndárs

having neglected to attend the Comptroller in order to prove their claim on account of Khálári or salt rents, he is to inform them that their claims will not be admitted unless they attend in future, and forbidding the collection of rents from the rayats. June 6.

162. Letter from Resident at Jaleswar (now in N. of Balasor), mentioning that a Sardár belonging to the Morbhani Rájá has entered the Dántan Parganá with some armed retainers, and burnt several villages. June 17.

163. Letter from Mr. MacDowal at Nadiyá, stating that the Rájá's officers have assumed authority over the Government Amíns; that the former have also been guilty of various acts of violence and carried off one of his officers, and that the collections are at a stand. June 13.

164. Letter to Mr. MacDowal, informing him that the settlement of Nadiyá for the current year is made with the Rájá, and directing him to return to the Presidency. June 24.

165. Letter from Mr. MacDowal, on the subjects of the acts of violence committed at Krishnagar. June 24.

166. Letter from Mr. MacDowal, reporting that the Zamíndárí officers have begun to collect the Revenue of Nadiyá for the current year. June 24.

167. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, enclosing a letter from Captain Maxwell, representing the distress of the troops at Barhampur for want of their pay. June 18.

168. Letter to Chief of Murshidábád in reply, directing him instantly to furnish the paymaster with the whole balance in his treasury for the immediate relief of the troops, and stating that several Collectors have been ordered to make immediate remittances to Murshidábád to supply the deficiency.

169. Order (Parwáná) to Rájá Nabakrishna, directing him to transmit an account-current between the Rájá of Bardwán and himself; and also to remit the Deori (collections) with the amount of his kists (instalments) to the Presidency. June 6.

170. Order (Parwáná) for the apprehension of Bhabáni Durlab Chakrabartti, Gobind Prasád, and the other persons concerned in seizing the Land-steward (Gumáshtá) of the Farmer of Chandradwíp. June 24.

171. Order (Parwáná) to the Zamíndár of Chandradwíp, directing her to send the persons seized by her people, without delay, to the Committee. June 24.

172. Order (Parwáná) to the Farmer of Chandradwíp, acquainting him with the orders issued by the Committee in consequence of his Land-steward's (Gumáshtá's) petition, and directing him to sequester the Zamíndár's Brahmottar and other lands, and stop her Musáhará (or allowance) until she complies with them. June 24.

173. Letter from Collector of Silhet, regarding the difficulties he meets with in conducting the business of the Province, and the causes to which they are to be attributed; also enclosing an Account Settlement of Silhet for 1191. June 24. Settlement approved of.

174. Letter from Resident at Tipperah, enclosing a Settlement of his District, and Kistbandí (instalment account) for the current year. June 17. Approved.

175. Letter from Mr. W. Wroughton, Judge at Bákarganj, on the subject of his judicial proceedings. June —. (No date.)

## JULY, 1782.

176. Petition from Rájá Nabakrishna, respecting the Mufassal settlement of Bardwán. July 2.

177. Petition from Zamíndárs of Parganás, Maimansinh, Alap Sinh, and Sherpur, complaining of extortion and violences of the Sanyásís. July 4.

178. Circular Letter to Collectors, directing them to prevent travellers who may be passing through the country from oppressing the inhabitants. July 18.

179. Letter from Company's Attorney, intimating that judgment had been given against Mr. Williamson, in favour of the Company, and requesting further instructions. July 8.

180. Letter from Company's Attorney, reporting that Mr. Williamson had been taken in execution, and was in custody of the Sheriff. July 18.

181. Letter from Chief of Dacca, on the subject of disputes occasioned by the interference of the Civil Judge at Bákarganj. July 8.

182. Letter to Díwán, directing him to call upon the Farmer of Silhet to adjust his accounts and pay up his balance. July 8.

183. Letter to Mr. G. Gustavus Ducarel, Commissioner of Bardwán, directing him to make the Mufassal Settlement of that District. July 2.

184. Letter from Mr. G. G. Ducarel, regarding the present state of the

Bardwán Province, and the difficulty he finds in making the Settlement. July 25.

185. Letter to Mr. G. Ducarel, informing him that the Committee cannot consent to any reduction in the Land-Revenue (Jamá), and enclosing an order (Parwáná) to the Rájá, directing him to come immediately to Calcutta. July 25.

186. Letter to Mr. John Evelyn, in Rájsháhí, requesting him to direct the Sazáwals of Rájsháhí to pay their instalments (kists) monthly to the Resident at the Darbár, so as to enable him to discharge the stipend of the Nawáb Mubárak-ud-daulá. July 22.

187. Letter from Governor-General and Council, directing the enforcement of the Company's demand against Mr. Williamson. July 11.

188. Letter to Governor-General, etc., recommending a new plan for conducting the Opium business. July 15.

189. Letter from Governor-General, etc., stating that after examining Mr. Duncan's report on the claims of the Zamíndárs of Morbhanj on the Parganá Bheloráchaur, the Council reject them as ill founded. July 22.

190. Letter to Mr. Henry Lodge, transmitting him a petition of the Zamíndárs of Maimansinh, Alap Sinh, and Sherpur, and directing him to repair to his station directly, and adjust the demands of the Sanyásís on the Zamíndárs, and report the result. July 4.

191. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, proposing sale of the Mahal of Fathijangpur, as all his endeavours to recover the balance due from the Zamíndár of Jahángírpur have proved ineffectual. July 8.

192. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, directing him to suspend the sale of the above lands, but to attach the Zamíndár's allowance (Musháhará). July 8.

193. Letter to Collector of Pánchet, authorizing him to conclude the settlement with the Zamíndár. July 4.

194. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá and Sazawál of Bardwán, informing them of the resolutions of the Board respecting their claims for remissions. July 11.

195. Letter from Preparer of Reports, reporting on the petition of the son of Sadásiá Barojiá, complaining of his father having been seized by the people of the Rájá of Nadiyá, with orders thereon. July 18.

196. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, complaining of the conduct of Jánakí Rám Sinh, and proposing that he be held responsible for

the revenue of such Zamíndárí officers as he has caused to abscond. July 8.

197. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, in reply, directing him to arrest Jánakí Rám Sinh, and keep him in close confinement till the return of the Zamíndárí Amlá; and to oblige him to give security to Rájá Debí Sinh for the payment of their revenues, etc. July 8.

198. Minute by Mr. John Shore, respecting the Settlement of Bardwán. July 2.

199. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting on the complaints preferred by Nanda Lál Rái against the Rání of Rájsháhí. July 4.

200. Letter from Mr. Edward Tiretta, proposing to build a public market-place. July 22.

201. Letter from Captain Williams, commanding the Sepoys at Purniah, stating the distress of his troops for want of their pay. July 11.

## AUGUST, 1782.

202. Petition from the Zamíndár of Nadiyá, respecting the difficulty of paying his balances. August 1.

203. Petition from Rájá Kalián Sinh, requesting payment of the present (nazráná) which he usually received from the Dutch. August 26.

204. Advertisement to all Zamíndárs, etc., explaining the nature of the increase of the Revenue, and the sources from which it is to be derived. August 5.

205. Letter from Mr. Samuel Charteris, laying before the Committee a copy of the Bardwán Settlement for 1189, and of the Engagement (Muchlaká), signed by the Díwán and Kárkún (agent) of Bardwán. August 19.

206. Letter to Company's Attorney, agreeing to the proposals for the liquidation of Mr. Williamson's debt to the Company, and directing him to carry it into execution. August 5.

207. Letter to Commissioner at Chinsurah, directing payment of present (nazráná) on account of Rájá Kalián Sinh. August 26.

208. Letter from Governor-General and Council, approving of the Establishment proposed for the protection of Rangpur District. August 1.

209. Letter to Governor-General, etc., recommending proposal ot the Collector of Rámgarh that a remission of revenue be granted

to the Ghátwáls of Kharakdiá. August 1. Authorized, August 19.

210. Letter from Governor-General, etc., with Amalnámas (*i.e.* orders for possession) for the settlement of certain districts in Behar. August 1.

211. Letter to Governor-General, etc., reporting the death of the old Zamíndár of Nadiyá. August 12.

212. Letter from Governor-General, etc., approving of the plan for conducting the opium business. August 19.

213. Letter to Governor-General, etc., regarding Rájá Kalián Sinh's complaint of the interference of the Darbhángá Adálat (court) in Revenue matters. August 26.

214. Letter from Governor-General, etc., prohibiting the sale of spirituous liquors within 10 miles of Calcutta. August 29.

215. Letter from Governor-General, etc., approving of the Bardwán Settlement. August 29.

216. Letter from Mr. D. H. M'Dowall, with accounts of the Collections of Nadiyá while under his superintendence. August 1.

217. Letter to Chief of Patna, instructing him to call upon the sons of Rájá Keálirám for payment of his balance, agreeably to Hindu Law. August 29.

218. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh, directing the immediate release of Lál Mohan Maháta, on his performance of the conditions he has offered, viz. of making compensation for the losses he occasioned by his depredations. August 1.

219. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, recommending that a remission of revenue be granted to the Ghátwáls of Kharakdiá, in consequence of their having nearly paid up all the rent of this year, and of their having suffered greatly from the depredations of Akbal Alí Khán. August 1. Approved, August 19.

220. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, reporting that Ajít Sinh having entered Kharakdiá, a company of Sepoys were sent after him and a conflict took place, in which he and two or three others were killed, and the rest dispersed. August 9.

221. Letter from Major Robertson, commanding Sepoys at Murád Bágh, stating that neither the Chief of Murshidábád nor Mr. Evelyn had any funds in hand for the payment of his Sepoys, who were eight months in arrears. August 12.

222. Letter from Collector of Silhet, reporting embarrassment to the

Collections from the interference of the Civil Courts. August (date omitted).

223. Letter from Collector of Silhet, stating that the Collections are at a stop, owing to the Zamíndárs being taken away to answer trifling complaints in the Taraf Adálat. August 12. Answered, August 24.

SEPTEMBER, 1782.

224. Letters from Rájá Kalián Sinh, regarding the proposal of Rájá Mitrajít Sinh for mortgaging portion of his Málikáná lands for payment of his balance. September (date omitted).

225. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, transmitting copy of Bhágalpur Bandobast (revenue settlement) and Kistbandí (instalment sheet) for the Behar year 1190. September 2.

226. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing him to make an inquiry into the Zamíndárs of Idalpur's complaint against the Farmer and Málzámin, that they have not paid them any part of the established allowance of 10 per cent. September 25.

227. Letter from Díwán, reporting the balance of the Mahals under the Chief of Patna to be Rs. 514,467 : 10 : 15. September 23.

228. Letter from Governor-General and Council, directing the Committee to pay certain private debts of the Rájá of Nadiyá from his Musháhará (allowance), making him answerable for his balances by a sale of his Zamíndárí, independent of that Fund. September 30.

229. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, on the subject of a complaint preferred by the Tálukdár of Mahíndrapur against the Zamíndár of Lashkarpur. September 19. Parwáná ordered.

230. Letter to Chief of Patna, on the subject of Rájá Kalián Sinh's letter; the proposal to mortgage Rájá Mitrajit's Málikáná lands not approved of, but if on the adjustment of his accounts there should be a balance against him, directing that a sufficient portion of his Zamíndárí be sold to liquidate it. September 5.

231. Order (Parwáná) to the Rání of Dinájpur and Jánakírám Sinh, on the subject of their behaviour in opposing the orders of the Committee for the benefit of the young Rájá. September 23.

232. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, enclosing a list of Jágdírárs paying rent to the Rájá of Rámgarh; instancing the good effect of Huzúrí collections; also regarding the Rájá of Rámgarh's in-

trigues; enclosing letter to Captain Ranken on the subject, with his reply, and recommending the Districts of Rámgarh being held Khás. September 30.

233. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, stating the obstacles he meets with, in making the reforms in the Rájá of Dinájpur's household, from the Rání and Jánakírám Sinh, and enclosing a representation from the person to whose care the young Rájá was entrusted. September 23. Order (Parwáná) issued.

234. Letter from Mr. H. Scott, Acting Collector of Calcutta, with a list of Bázárs and Háts (markets) in Calcutta. September 17.

235. Letter to Mr. Tiretta, informing him the Board has consented to his proposals for erecting a market. September 30.

## OCTOBER, 1782.

236. Advertisement published in the District of Maimansinh, etc., informing the Zamíndárs and Sanyásí Merchants that Mr. Lodge has been appointed to adjust their claims, and directing them to attend on that gentleman, or their complaints will not be heard. October 3.

237. Advertisement, notifying that if the Tálukdárs, etc., of Midnapur proper, Mainácháurá, Nárájol, and Balrámpur, do not pay up their arrears within ten days, their lands will be sold to make good the deficiency. October 11.

238. Petition from Bikramárjit and Bhupnáráyan, on the subject of their Málikáná received through the Chief of Patna. October 21.

239. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, enclosing a list of villages which he has sold for part payment of balances due by Harnáráyan and Ajít Sinh, and requesting to know if he shall stop their Nánkár or allowance for the remainder, and requesting orders respecting the villages in Dharampur Rati. October 7.

240. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, in reply, approving of the sale, and requesting him to carry the allowance (Nánkár) to credit; to examine the Deed (Sanad) for Dharampur, and if dated subsequent to the grant of the Díwání, to resume it. October 7.

241. Letter from Major Brown, transmitting his final accounts with the Company for the Revenue of the Jungletari lands, a tract of country to the north of Purniah and Tirhut, at the foot of the hills. October 21.

242. Letter to Major Brown, in reply, directing him to pay the balance

of Rs. 45,580:4:3 as Collector of Jungleteri into the principal revenue (Khalsá) Treasury. October 21.

243. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, directing them to forward a comparative statement of the price of grain in their several districts for the last three months, and also for the last two preceding years; also of the state of the late and ensuing harvest; and also to accompany their Monthly Prices Current with an explanation of any extraordinary rise or fall in the price of grain. October 24.

244. Letter from Chief of Dacca, stating that a stop has been put to the Collections of Srípur, by Mr. Lodge having confined the Zamíndár, and requesting an order for his release. October 9.

245. Letter to Chief of Dacca, in reply, reporting having written to Mr. Lodge for the release of the Srípur Zamíndár. October 9.

246. Letter from Chief of Dacca, forwarding a petition, charging the Zamíndár of Bhuluá with the robbery of two boats of Treasure. October 21.

247. Letter to Chief of Dacca, in reply, directing him to summon the Zamíndár, and in case of his non-attendance, to declare his title forfeited. October 21.

248. Letter from Mr. Jonathan Duncan, Superintendent of the Mázúlí Daftar,—an office formerly kept up for the examination and adjustment of disputed accounts or outstanding balances, especially those of officers who had been dismissed, or were charged with embezzlement or with undue exactions,—reporting having taken charge, and representing such circumstances as require the Committee's assistance in re-establishing his office. October 4.

249. Letter to Mr. Jonathan Duncan, informing him that he is deputed to Patna for the purpose of dispossessing Rájá Kalián Sinh and forming a New Settlement of his Mahals, with instructions thereon. October 11.

250. Letter to Mr. John Evelyn, referring to him for Report, the disputes between the Zamíndárs of Lashkarpur and Rájsháhi. October 9.

251. Letter from Governor-General and Council, approving of the measures adopted with regard to Kalián Sinh, and the appointment of Mr. Duncan to execute it. October 11.

252. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing a circular letter sent to Chiefs and Collectors in consequence of a representation that from the want of rain during the past month, the harvest would be affected. October 24.

253. Letter to Governor-General, on the subject of the Collector of Rámgarh's address respecting the Settlement of his District. October 31.

254. Letter to Governor-General, etc., regarding the complaints of the Zamíndár of Bháwal. October 31.

255. Letter from Mr. H. Lodge, regarding the complaints of the Zamíndárs of Maimansinh, etc., against the Sanyásís (or wandering religious mendicants), and enclosing extracts from the proceedings of the late Council at Dacca on the subject. October 3.

256. Letter to Mr. Lodge, directing him to release the Zamíndár of Srípur, and not in future to confine any Zamíndár or Farmer until he has represented the circumstances. October 9.

257. Letter from Chief of Patna, reporting having dispossessed Bikramárjit and Bhupnáráyan, and enclosing sundry representations (Arzís) from them. October 21.

258. Parwáná to the Rájáh of Tipperah, informing him that an allowance of Rs. 1000 per month has been made him, but which will only be paid during his residence at Kumillá. October 3.

259. Letter to Collector of Sarkár Sáran, directing him to conclude the Settlement of his District agreeably to enclosed statement, requesting him to release Rám Chánd Pandit, and to make a direct land settlement with the cultivator (Aman Bandobast) in Champáran for 1190–91. October 4.

## NOVEMBER, 1782.

260. Petition from Hari Krishna, complaining of Rájá Dámodar Bhanj. November 7.

261. Petition from Rájá Kalián Sinh, representing his cheerful acquiesence in the Committee's orders. November 11.

262. Petition from the village heads (Chaudhrís) of the Parganás in Maimansinh, transmitted by Mr. Lodge. November 25.

263. Petition from the Rájá of Bardwán, representing the difficulty he will be under in paying up his balances. November 28.

264. Advertisement, notifying the letting of the Estate of Kásijorá in farm. November 18.

265. Letter from Chief of Dacca, transmitting a petition from Dulol Ghosh, Farmer of Nasirujial, requesting permission to resign his farm on account of the turbulent spirit of the Zamíndárs. November 7.

266. Letter to Chief of Dacca, in reply, consenting to the above request on certain conditions, and directing him to summon the Zamíndárs complained of, and inquire into their conduct. November 7.

267. Letter from Governor-General and Council, stating that they have assumed the office of Head Civil Court (Sadr Díwání Adálat), and mean to revise the proceedings of it from the time of the arrival of the late Act of Parliament, and to receive all Appeals. November 25.

268. Letter from Governor-General, etc., enclosing a letter from the Commercial Resident at Sonámukhí to the Board of Trade, complaining of his business being interrupted by the Rájá of Bardwán, and directing the Committee to issue the necessary orders for preventing such obstructions in future. November 28.

269. Letter from Governor-General, etc., directing the Committee to acquaint the Rájá of Nadiyá that in default of the payment of his Revenue, such a portion of his Zamíndárí as will be sufficient for the discharge of his balance will be advertised for sale; directing that if the Zamíndár of Rámgarh should refuse to resume his agreement on the terms of last year, a Khás Settlement should be made with the Jághírdárs; Major Crawford directed to proceed to Jhálida in Mánbhúm, in order to quiet the disturbances there, and investing him with the charge of the Collections under the Committee's instructions. November 28.

270. Letter from Mr. Henry Lodge, enclosing statements and accounts relative to the business committed to his management, and reporting having received intelligence that sundry Mohants have assembled a large body of Sanyásís without any apparent motive for such unusual conduct. November 25.

271. Letter from Chief of Patna, enclosing a petition from the Merchants and Bankers (Shroffs) of Patna, praying for the establishment of a Mint. November 28.

272. Letter from Collector of Pánchet, reporting that the Zamíndár of Pánchet is exposed to daily depredations from the petty estates (Mahals) of Jhálidá from want of Sepoys; also reporting that the Zamíndárs of Nayágarh and Jiriá have lately plundered two villages, and that the latter withholds his rent. November 7.

273. Letter to Collector of Pánchet, informing him of Major Crawford having been appointed to quell the disturbances in Jhálidá, and to take charge of the Collections there. November 28.

274. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Bardwán, informing him that no pleas or evasions will be admitted for withholding the rents, which must be paid agreeably to his Kistbandí, and insisting on his immediately remitting the balance of his Kist. November 25.

275. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Bardwán, calling on him to answer the complaints preferred against him and his officers for the obstructions caused by them in the business of the Factory (Aurang) of Sonámukhí, and warning him to beware of such conduct in future. November 28.

276. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh, informing him that the Board has been pleased to direct a Khás settlement of Rámgarh with the Jághírdárs, in case the Rájá will not consent to renew his agreement on the terms of last year. November 28.

277. Letter from Collector of Silhet, stating the difficulty he meets with in the Collection of the Revenues. November 11.

278. Letter to Collector of Silhet, authorizing him to sell the necessary portions of land for the recovery of last year's balances, and to conclude the settlement for the present year. November 11.

279. Letter from Mr. John Shore, Acting President, laying before the Committee proposals for farming Midnapur and Jaleswar. November 11.

280. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, enclosing general account settlement of his District for 1189. November 14.

281. Letter from Resident at Tipperah, representing that the Rájá's infirmities totally prevent his attendance at Kumillá, and requesting permission to pay his stipulated allowances to his nephew on his appearance. November 25.

282. Letter to Resident at Tipperah, in reply, consenting thereto, on condition that the nephew resides at Kumillá, and produces proper authority for receiving the allowance. November 25.

283. Letter from Mr. Jonathan Duncan, reporting his arrival at Patna, and the results of his interview with Mahárájá Kalián Sinh; also enclosing five bills of exchange on account of the Rájá's balances, and stating that security had been given for the remainder. November 11.

284. Letter to Mr. Duncan, approving of his conduct, and directing him to call upon the Rájá to know how he means to discharge the remainder of his balances, and to prevent his assigning any of the current Kists to his creditors. November 11.

## DECEMBER, 1782.

285. Petition from Mahárájá Kalián Sinh, requesting to be allowed a longer time in future for remitting his instalments (kists). December 12.

286. Petition from Jamál Khán, requesting the interference of Government to procure the release of his collectors and peons made prisoners by the Zamíndár of Sarfrázpur. December 12.

287. Petition from the Rájá of Nadiyá, on the subject of the payment of his debts due to the Maháj ans. December 23.

288. Petitions from Rájá of Bardwán, stating having made considerable remittances on account of his current Kists, but is unable to realise the old balances on account of the impoverished state in which the Government Revenue Collector (Sazáwal) left the Zamíndárí. December 23.

289. Petition from Mahárájá Kalián Sinh, proposing to settle his claims on Rájá Mitrajit Sinh, by a mortgage of his percentage of the Collections (Málikáná). December 30.

290. Letter from Mr. Robert Bathurst, Superintendent of the Collections under Mahárájá Kalián Sinh, directing Rájá Mitrajit Sinh's Málikáná villages to be put under attachment, and directing him to pursue the plan of adjustment adopted by Mr. Duncan; also enclosing a copy of that gentleman's proceedings for his information. December 30.

291. Letter from Mr. Jonathan Duncan, reporting having completed his inquiry into the claims of Mahárájá Kalián Sinh on Rájá Mitrajit Sinh, and transmitting his proceedings on the subject. December 12. Approved, with certain exceptions.

292. Letter from Díwán, laying before the Committee an account settlement for 1189. December 26.

293. Letter to Governor-General and Council, forwarding copy of letter from the Chief of Murshidábád, complaining of the insolence and disobedience of his Díwán. December 2.

294. Letter from Governor-General, etc., with copy of letter and enclosures received from the Comptroller of the Salt Office, complaining of obstructions he meets on the part of the Rájá of Nadiyá, and directing the Committee to summon the Rájá to Calcutta to answer for his conduct. December 23.

295. Letter to Governor-General, etc., regarding Mahárájá Kalián Sinh's claims on Rájá Mitrajit Sinh, with a proposal to recover

the debt by attaching the Rájá's Málikáná villages. December 30.

296. Letter to Collector of Húglí, reporting having deputed a land surveyor (Amín) to Sarfrázpur, Kilki, and Amínpur, to inquire into the accusations brought against the Zamíndár by the Farmer. December 12.

297. Letter to Collector of Húglí, directing him to send to the Presidency any Tálukdárs, etc., belonging to Kilki, Sarfrázpur, or Amínpur, now in confinement in his Court Kachárí, with an exact statement of their balances. December 30.

298. Letter to Mr. Henry Lodge, requesting to be informed whether it was likely that the Sanyásís would generally accede to the adjustment requested by the Zamíndárs, supposing that mode were approved of by Government. December 30.

299. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, stating that the Committee have concluded the settlement with the principal renters of his district, and transmitting him copies thereof; and stating that no renters will be permitted to renew their leases except at the same rental (Jamá) as last year, and on condition that they enter into engagements for the liquidation of their balances. December 2.

300. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, complaining of the insolence and disobedience of his Díwán, and requesting his punishment. December 2.

301. Letter to Mr. M'Dowall, directing him, in consequence of the repeated complaints preferred by the Commercial Resident at Sonámukhí against the officers of the Rájá of Bardwán, to repair to the spot and investigate the matter. December 26.

302. Order (Parwáná) to several persons indebted to Rájá Debí Sinh, directing them to pay up their balances, or they will be severely punished. December 5.

303. Order (Parwáná) to Rájá of Nadiyá, directing him immediately to repair to the Presidency. December 23.

304. Letter to Chief of Purniah from the Collector of Rangpur, informing him of the probability of his district being entered by a party of armed Sanyásís, or religious Hindu mendicants, who had passed through Rangpur. December 16.

305. Letter to Chief of Purniah, directing him not to send any force to oppose the above Sanyásís, except he deems it fully adequate to the service, nor to attempt to cut off their retreat from his province. December 16.

306. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, stating that he has prevailed upon the Zamíndár to sign his Kabúliyat and pay off almost the whole of the balance due on account of the present year; but as the country has suffered greatly for want of rain, recommending the Zamíndár be indulged in a deduction of rent after having paid up the heavy kists. December 26. Directed to ascertain and report the exact loss sustained by the failure of the crop.

307. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting the progress made in the settlement of Midnapur. December 5.

## JANUARY, 1783.

308. Petition from the Rájá of Nadiyá, in answer to the Order (Parwáná) summoning him to the Presidency. January 2.

309. Letter to Mr. John Bayne, Agent to the Embankment (Pulbandí) Contractor of Bardwán, enclosing the estimate given by the Rájá of Bardwán of the loss sustained by the breaking of the embankments (puls) in 1188, and requiring his reply to it. January 2.

310. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, reporting having put the Málikáná villages of Rájá Bikramárjit Sinh under attachment. January 2.

311. Letter to Chief of Dacca, reporting having received information from Mr. Lodge that Sháh Madgerud has entered the Jafarsháhí Parganá with a large body of followers, and directing him to use every means in his power to apprehend him, but not to run any risk by detaching a force that is not fully adequate to the service. January 13.

312. Letter to Governor-General and Council, on the subject of the disputes between the Rájá of Bardwán and Nadiyá, and proposing that a Company's servant should be deputed to the spot to investigate the matter. January 9. Approved, January 13.

313. Letter to Governor-General, etc., requesting orders on a plan proposed by the Collector of Tirhut for encouraging new settlers in the uncultivated parts of his district. January 20.

314. Letter from Governor-General, etc., directing that none of the Company's opium be disposed of under Rs. 20 per chest. January 30.

315. Letter from Mr. Henry Lodge, reporting Sháh Madgerud having entered Parganá Jafarsháhí and begun to oppress the cultivators (rayats). January 13.

316. Letter to Mr. Lodge, in reply, directing him by no means to run a risk by detaching too small a force against Sháh Madgerud, but to do everything in his power to apprehend him, and if necessary, to apply to the Chief of Dacca for assistance. January 13.

317. Letter from Mr. H. Lodge, reporting a skirmish between a party of his Sepoys and Sháh Madgerud, who, after having lost a number of his followers, fled into the jungle. January 23.

318. Letter from Chief of Purniah, stating that the repeated violences committed by the Sanyásís (or beggar army), in the eastern part of his district, has induced him to detach Captain Williams, with a sufficient force, to check their progress. January 20.

319. Letter from Chief of Purniah, reporting that the Sanyásís left the district as soon as they heard of the approach of Captain Williams' detachment. January 27.

320. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, requesting permission to accept an offer made by the Rangpur Merchants of paying fifty thousand Sikká rupees in exchange for one Lákh of new Náráyaní rupees. January 16.

321. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting on the state of the Revenues of Jalálpur. January 2.

322. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, representing the expediency of the renters of his district being permitted to pay a certain proportion of their instalments (kists) in grain, etc. January 20.

## FEBRUARY, 1783.

323. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, praying that Mír Kamál-ud-dín Husain, Farmer of Rangpur, may be entirely dismissed. February 6.

324. Petition from Mahárájá Kalián Sinh, on the subject of the Estates (Mahals) taken from under his management and placed under that of the Chief of Patna. February 13.

325. Petition from the Rájá of Bhután, requesting that sundry places near the hills may be put under the jurisdiction of the Collector of Rangpur. February 20.

326. Petition from the Zamíndár of Bardwán, with an estimate of the cost for repairing the embankment (puls) in his Zamíndárí. February 24.

327. Petition from Bikramárjit Sinh, Zamíndár of Sháhábád, praying

to be reimbursed his expenses in assisting Government during the late troubles at Benares. February 27.

328. Petition from the Zamíndár of Sháhábád, claiming his allowance of Musháhará, or monthly stipend. February 27.

329. Petition from the Farmer of Purniah, requesting Rs. 60,000 on account of Takáví advances to the cultivators. February 27.

330. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, stating that Mahárájá Kalián Sinh's credit at Patna being at an end, he has permitted him to go to Benares, as the only probable means left of releasing his instalment (kist) for Paush, but, notwithstanding this, the Mahárájá has collected Rs. 240,000 more than he has remitted. February 13.

331. Letter to Mr. Bathurst, enclosing an Order (Parwáná) to the Mahárájá. February 13.

332. Letter to Mr. Hugh Baily, informing him the Board has directed that such places on the borders of Bhután as are not in the jurisdiction of the Collector of Rangpur, be immediately put under him. February 20.

333. Letter to Mr. Joseph Champion, Superintendent of the Zamíndárí Daftar, on the subject of the allowances granted to the Zamíndár of Sátsiká Nadiyá. February 10.

334. Letter from Company's Attorney, reporting having received from the Sheriff the full sum due to the Company by Mr. Williamson. February 13.

335. Letter to the Díwán, with sundry questions respecting the relations between Zamíndárs and their under-renters in cases of increase or remission of rent. February 27.

336. Letter from Commissioner at Bardwán, applying to the Board for sanction for a grant procured from the Rájá of Bardwán, for a quantity of waste ground as a provision for a Mughul family. February 20.

337. Letter from Governor-General and Council, reporting having written to the Collector of Silhet on the subject of the disturbances there; and also authorizing an allowance of Rs. 400 per month to the Zamíndár of Sátsiká in Nadiyá. February 3.

338. Letter to Governor-General, etc., on the subject of a proposal of the Collector of Rájmahal and Bhágalpur, for farming the districts under his charge for five years, on a lease being granted him for that period. February 27.

339. Letter to Governor-General, etc., informing of the arrival of the

Rájá of Nadiyá at the Presidency, agreeably to their orders. February 27.

340. Letter to Governor-General, etc., requesting orders on a petition of Rájá Bikramárjit Sinh, for a reimbursement of expenses incurred by him during the commotions at Benares. February 27.

341. Letter from Mr. Henry Lodge, on the subject of the force and intentions of the Sanyásís, or beggar army, stating he does not deem it advisable to use violent measures; but recommends that the military force on the spot be continued to keep them in awe. February 10.

342. Letter from Mr. H. Lodge, stating his reasons for sending an Order (Parwáná) to Sháh Madgerud. February 10.

343. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Bardwán, directing him to pay the arrears due to the Surgeon at that station. February 27.

344. Letter from Collector at Pánchet, requesting the assistance of a small number of Sepoys to support the Zamíndár in collecting the Revenues. February 13.

345. Letter to Collector of Pánchet, directing him to apply to Captain Macgregor for the Sepoys, but only to use them in cases of resistance to public orders. February 13.

346. Letter to Mr. J. D. Paterson, appointing him to investigate the causes of the present disturbances in Rangpur, with instructions. February 17.

347. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, regarding the losses the districts under him have sustained from the failure of the crops in consequence of the drought, enclosing representations (árzís) from the Zamíndár's land surveyors (amíns) relative thereto, and recommending them to the indulgence of Government. February 27.

348. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh, in reply, authorizing such temporary suspension of demands as actual necessity may point out. February 27.

349. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, reporting on a disturbance which occurred in his district, and the measures adopted by him to prevent its bad effects, and secure the Revenues to Government; and requesting the Committee to issue an Order (Parwáná) to the Zamíndárs in support of his orders, and enjoining them to pay up their balances. February 6.

350. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, in reply, approving of the steps taken by him, and directing him to investigate the causes of the

insurrection and report thereon; but not to sell any lands for balances without a reference to the Committee. February 6.

351. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, reporting the disturbances having again broken out with greater violence; and stating that he was obliged to dispatch Lieut. M'Donald against the insurgents, who were now, however, in a great measure quieted; also endeavouring to trace out the causes of the disturbances, and pointing out a probable measure for satisfying the cultivators. February 17.

352. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, in reply, stating that the disturbances having taken such a serious turn, the Committee thought it necessary to make a particular inquiry into their causes, and had accordingly deputed Mr. J. D. Patterson to Rangpur to make a local investigation; desiring to be furnished with particular information respecting the tobacco crop, in order to be able to decide upon the Collector's proposal for satisfying the rayats; enclosing an advertisement to be made public in Rangpur, exhorting the rayats to return to their habitations. February 17.

353. Letter from Mr. John Shore, reporting on the evidence sent in by Mr. Redfearn, respecting dispute between Rájá Debí Sinh and Mr. Christie. February 13.

## MARCH, 1783.

354. Petition from Rájá Mitrajit Sinh, stating his claim to Salámi. March 3.

355. Petition from Rájá of Tipperah, requesting payment of the arrears of his allowances. March 10.

356. Petition from Farmer of Purníah, proposing to take that district in farm for two years longer. March 17.

357. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, requesting that the lands of such Zamíndárs as are in arrears to him may be sold to make good the balances. March 17.

358. Petition from the Rájá of Nadiyá, proposing a way of discharging his balances without alienating any of his lands. March 31.

359. Advertisement, preventing any further collections on account of the Revenues of this year in Dinájpur and Idrakpur. March 24.

360. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, stating that Mahárájá Kalián Sinh having been unable to procure bills to discharge his Paush Revenue Instalment (kist), he had demanded his collection (wasilat

accounts), and taken an engagement (Muchlakás) from the different Revenue Collectors (amils) binding themselves to pay nothing henceforward to the Mahárájá's account. March —. Approved.

361. Letter from Agent to the Embankment (Pulbandí) Contractor at Bardwán, replying to the assertions of the Rájá of Bardwán respecting the failure of the embankments (puls) in that Province. March 3.

362. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, respecting the settlement of his district for the ensuing year, and recommending a Khás settlement in preference to any other. March 3.

363. Letter from Major Crawford, giving an account of the condition in which he found the estate of Jhálidá in Mánbhúm on his arrival, and of the measures adopted for restoring tranquillity. March 3. Approved.

364. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, respecting the Madrasás, or Seminaries of Learning, that may be in their respective districts. March 3.

365. Circular Letters to Chiefs and Collectors, directing them to apprehend and send to the Presidency all Europeans within their respective districts, who have no licence for their residence there. March 17.

366. Letter to Mr. James Christie, directing him to discharge immediately the balance due from him to the Farmer of Dinájpur, on account of the revenues of Apail. March 20.

367. Letter from Collector of Dacca, enclosing copy of a letter from Mr. Lodge, applying for a reinforcement of 50 Sepoys, and of his answer to that gentleman, stating his inability to comply with the request. March 10. Afterwards complied with. March 24.

368. Letter from Mr. John Evelyn, reporting the existence of heavy balances in Rájsháhí, although the cultivators (rayats) complain of undue exactions, and proposing to make an inquiry into the collections realised by the Amil. March 3. Approved.

369. Letter from Governor-General and Council, directing that the village of Phalch Kach be delivered up to the Rájá of Bhután. March 3.

370. Letter from Governor-General, etc., enclosing a petition from Mirzá Abdullá Beg, and a copy of resolutions on the claims of the Rájá of Nepál, which the Committee is directed to carry

into execution by restoring Mirzá Abdullá Beg to the possession of Rothal and its dependencies. March 3.

371. Letter from Governor-General, etc., approving of the mode proposed for adjusting the claims of Mahárájá Kalián Sinh. March 3.

372. Letter to Governor-General, etc., regarding the commotions in Rangpur, and the measures adopted by the Committee for quelling them. March 3.

373. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing copy of a letter and report from Mr. M'Dowal, on the disputes between the Commercial Resident at Sonámukhi and the Officers of the Rájá of Bardwán, together with the resolutions passed on the Report by the Committee. March 6.

374. Letter from Governor-General, etc., directing the Committee to remove all the private factories in the Aurang of Lakhmípur, as they interfere with the purchases of the Commercial Resident; and to direct all other private European Agents or Traders who reside in the districts without a special licence to return within ten miles of the Presidency. March 27.

375. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing copy of the Committee's proceedings respecting the balances due from the Rájá of Nadiyá. March 31.

376. Letter from Collector of Húglí, enclosing a petition from the late Farmer of Sarfrázpur and Aminpur. March 20.

377. Letter from Mr. J. D. Paterson, on deputation to Rangpur, stating that on his arrival he found the country restored to tranquillity, and that he would proceed with his inquiry as soon as the prisoners were sent in. March 13.

378. Letter from Mr. Paterson, requesting to be informed how to act in case the Farmer Rájá Debí Sinh should molest the rayats who present complaints before him. March 17.

379. Letter to Mr. Paterson, in reply, enclosing an Order (Parwáná) to the Farmer, enjoining obedience to Mr. Paterson's orders. March 17.

380. Letter to Mr. Paterson, directing him to give every assistance in his power to the Farmer in recovering the arrears justly due to him from his under-renters. March 20.

381. Letter from Mr. Paterson, stating he is somewhat embarrassed how to act with respect to the prisoners taken during the insurrection, for want of proofs in support of the accusations preferred against them. March 31.

382. Letter from Chief of Patna, stating that, having proceeded into Parganás Arrah and Barágiá to investigate the state of those Districts, he met with such opposition and contumacious behaviour from the Revenue Collector (Amil), that he found it necessary to place him in confinement, especially as he was accused of having embezzled Rs. 34,000 of the public money; in the meantime, the settlement of the Parganás in question was effected by land surveyors (Amíns). The country had suffered greatly for want of rain. March 31. Approved.

383. Letter to Chief of Purniah, directing him to despatch to Rangpur as many Sepoys as he can spare, with all possible expedition. March 3.

384. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Bardwán, forbidding him to interfere with the business of the Commercial Resident at Sonámukhí or any of the other Factories. March 6.

385. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Nadiyá, stating the accusations preferred against him by the Comptroller of the Salt Office, and requiring him to deliver an answer thereto within five days. March 13.

386. Letter from Mr. John Pagan, with proposals for farming and bringing into cultivation the Waste lands on the Frontiers of Purniah. March 3.

387. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, enclosing the Settlement of his District for 1190 Faslí. March 3.

388. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, forwarding a regular narrative of the late disturbances in his District, and of the orders he has been under the necessity of issuing in consequence. March 24.

389. Letter from Mr. John Shore, Acting President, informing the Committee that he has received intelligence that the disturbances in the Rangpur District are nearly at an end. March 3.

390. Letter from the Resident at Tipperah, enclosing a petition from the Rájá for the payment of his arrears of allowances; and stating that he has been paid the allowance for January, in consequence of the Rájá's nephew having made a personal application for it. March 10.

391. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, in reply, stating that the Rájá's request for payment of his arrears of allowances cannot be complied with, it being forfeited by his non-appearance. March 10.

392. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, regarding the interruptions thrown in the way of the Salt Business by the Rájá of Nadiyá,

and enclosing a report thereon from Mr. Evans, who was sent to make a local investigation into the matter. March 13.

## APRIL, 1783.

393. Petition from Gangá Náráin Chaudhrí, requesting that a Deed (Sanad) may be made out for the share (Kismat) of Parganá Bhuluá purchased by him. April 3.

394. Petition from Jánakírám and others, Merchants in Nepál, requesting to be allowed to hold in Farm certain lands in Pargáná Bátiah. April 14.

395. Petition from the Village Heads (Chaudhrís) of Maimansinh, praying that Mr. Lodge may be authorized to allow them three years for the payment of their debt to the Sanyásís. April 17.

396. Petition from the Zamíndárs of Maimansinh, etc., complaining of the violences of the Sanyásís. April 17.

397. Advertisement forbidding any Collections being made in Nadiyá by the Rájá or his officials (Amlá). April 17.

398. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, stating that the Mahárájá's extreme indolence obliges him to interfere in the Collections, which would otherwise be at a stand-still. April 17.

399. Letter to Mr. Bathurst, in reply, directing him to supersede the Mahárájá's authority and make the Collections himself. April 17.

400. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, respecting his proposal for farming his District. April 14.

401. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, authorizing him to conclude the Settlement for the ensuing year (1190). April 17.

402. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, approving of his plan for the Settlement of his District, and directing him to enter upon it immediately. April 14.

403. Letter from Major Crawford, in charge of the collections at Jhálidá in Manbhúm, requesting directions respecting Mangal Sháh, who has given himself up on a promise that his life should be spared. April 17.

404. Letter to Major Crawford, in reply, directing him to keep Mangal Sháh in confinement until he gives security for his future good behaviour. April 17.

405. Letter from Pathenio Constantino, representing certain hardships the Greek Merchants in Silhet labour under, and praying that they may be redressed. April 17.

406. Letter to Commissioner at Bardwán, directing him to take measures for the improvement of the Aimá lands, and to place them under the management of a proper person, and after deducting such part of the produce as is due to the Zamíndárs of Bardwán, to apply the remainder in repairing the Muhammadan School (Madrasá) and Mosque. April 7.

407. Letter to Mr. John Evelyn, directing him to conclude a Khás settlement for Rajsháhi for 1190. April 14.

408. Letter from Governor-General and Council, directing that Mr. Edward Hardwick be required to leave Bárnipur. April 3.

409. Letter from Governor-General, etc., annulling the grant made to Mr. David Killican of the exclusive privilege of trading to Assam, but continuing him his former advantages till the end of December for the adjustment of his affairs. April 14.

410. Letter to Governor-General, etc., reporting the death of the Nawáb of Purniah. April 14.

411. Letter from Governor-General, etc., stating that the claims of Bikramarjit Sinh to a reimbursement cannot be admitted without further proofs in support of them; and approving of arrangements respecting the balances of Nadiyá and the succession to Sátsiká Estate. April 17.

412. Letter to Mr. M'Dowall, directing him to proceed to Dinajpur and make a Khás settlement of that District for 1190. April 24.

413. Letter from the Chief of Patna, reporting on a Muhammadan Educational Establishment (Madrasá) in his District, and proposals for maintaining it. April 17.

414. Letter from Mr. J. D. Paterson, stating new charges preferred by the cultivators of Rangpur against Rájá Debí Sinh. April 14.

415. Letter from Chief of Purniah, representing the oppressions the cultivators suffer from the Farmer, and requesting instructions with regard to his conduct. April 14.

416. Letter from Mr. Redfearn, with a narrative of the causes, progress, etc. of the disturbances in Fathijangpur. April 17.

417. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, directing him to make a Mufassal Settlement of his District for the ensuing year. April 14.

418. Letter from Preparer of Reports, reporting on the disputes between the Zamíndárs of Amrábád. April 7.

419. Letter from Mr. John Shore, Acting President, informing the Committee that he has sent orders for the recall of Rájá Debí Sinh from Rangpur. April 17.

420. Letter from Collector of Silhet, enclosing copy of an address to the Honourable Board, containing proposals for freighting vessels from Silhet with rice for Madras. April 14.

421. Letter to Collector of Silhet, enclosing letter from Constantino Pathenio, and directing that the hardships said to be suffered by the Greek Merchants in Silhet be removed. April 17.

## MAY, 1783.

422. Petition from Báránasi Ghosh, with proposals for farming the Government Estate (Khás Mhals) of the twenty-four Parganás. May 15.

423. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, on the transfer of the Kánkjol Zamíndárí. May 1.

424. Letter to Commissioner at Bardwán, respecting the agreement for the repair of the embankments (puls) in the Government Khás, Táluks, and Dewrí Lands of Bardwán. May 1.

425. Letter from Collector of Calcutta, reporting on the complaint of the Bázár Farmer. May 15.

426. Letter from Mr. John Evelyn, on the disputes between the Zamíndárs of Rájsháhi and Láskarpur. May 12.

427. Letter from Governor-General and Council, on the transfer of the Kánkjol Zamíndárí, the Jágír of the late Alí Kasim Khán, etc., directing a Deed (Sanad) in favour of Shaikh Muhammad Rafí. May 1.

428. Letter from Governor-General, etc., enclosing a letter from the Board of Trade, complaining of the obstructions experienced by their Chief at Lakshmipur from the Farmer of Bhuluá. May 1.

429. Letter from Governor-General, etc., on the charges preferred by the Collector of Tirhut against the Judge of the Civil Court (Díwání Adálat) at Darbhángá. May 8.

430. Letter from Governor-General, etc., directing the restoration of the Kánúngo Establishment. May 22.

431. Letter to Mr. H. Lodge, directing him to repair to Lakshmipur to investigate the complaints preferred by the Commercial Chief against the Farmer of Bhuluá. May 1.

432. Letter to Chief of Patna, respecting petitions from the renter and Tálukdárs of Parganá Chainpur Sasserám, etc., presented to the Governor-General, etc. May 1.

433. Order (Parwáná) to Zamíndárs, etc., fixing the time for holding

the Punyá, the date on which the under tenants make their first payment of the annual revenue. May 29.

434. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, enclosing the adjusted accounts between the Zamíndárs, etc. of Rangpur and the Sadr Farmer. May 26.

435. Letter to Mr. F. Redfearn, appointing him arbitrator on the part of the Company, to settle a dispute respecting the boundaries of Serampur. May 15.

436. Letter from Preparer of Reports, reporting on a petition from the Zamíndárs of Bhuluá. May 8.

437. Letter to Mr. John Shore, directing him to inform the Magistrates' (Fauzdárí) Court at Murshidábád of the charges against the principals in the late disturbances at Fathijangpur. May 5.

438. Letter from Governor of Serampur, reporting having appointed Mr. Gilbert arbitrator on the side of the Danes, in the dispute respecting the boundaries of Serampur. May 15.

439. Letter to Board of Trade, regarding measures for preventing further disputes at Sonámukhí. May 22.

440. Letter to Mr. George Vansittart, with instructions for his guidance in making the Settlement of Nadiyá. May 22.

## JUNE, 1783.

441. Petition from the Rájá of Kásijorá, proposing various modes for the settlement of his Zamíndárí. June 26.

442. Letter from Governor-General, etc., on Mr. Baines' claims on the Rájá of Bardwán, and Mr. Pagan's proposals for farming the waste lands bordering on Purniah. June 9.

443. Letter from Mr. M'Dowall, deputed to make the Settlement of Dinájpur, stating his having met with much opposition in the public business from the Zamíndárí officials (Amlá), and requesting the Committee to write a parwáná to Janakirám Sinh, the Rájá's Guardian. June 26.

444. Letter from Mr. J. D. Paterson, transmitting his report on the objects of his late deputation to Rangpur. June 19.

445. Letter from Chief of Patna, enclosing a petition from Mirzá Abdullá, requesting the assistance of a military force to put him in possession of Rothal and Pashrautá. June 2.

446. Letter from F. Redfearn, containing his and Mr. Gilbert's award respecting the disputed lands at Serampur. June 2.

447. Letter from Collector of Silhet, pleading the inability of the Zamíndárs as the real cause of the balances in his District, and proposing to collect the rents directly from the Tálukdárs, without the intermediate agency of the Zamíndárs, as being a measure which will increase the Jamá of his District. June 19.

448. Letter to Collector of Silhet, consenting to his proposals, but directing that the greatest caution be used in introducing the innovation. June 19.

## JULY, 1783.

449. Petition from Balrám Sarmá, Jainaráin Dás, Kamal Kánt Dás, Rudra Naráin Sarmá, and Rámkánt Sarmá, proposing to farm jointly the District of Rájsháhi. July 3.

450. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, requesting the interference of Government to assist him in recovering his balances, and transmitting the Dinájpur accounts during his management. July 10.

451. Petition from the Tálukdár of Maidpur, complaining of the Zamíndár of Lashkarpur. July 17.

452. Petition from the cultivators (rayats) of Bírbhúm, setting forth sundry oppressions exercised upon them. July 24.

453. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, reporting decrease in the Revenue of the Parganás rented by Mahárájá Kalián Sinh, etc. July 3.

454. Letter from Resident at Bhográi, furnishing information respecting the sources of Revenue, Duties, etc. of his District. July 10.

455. Letter to Resident at Bhográi, directing the abolition of the Ráhádárí duties, etc., and desiring that the Settlement be concluded as soon as possible. July 10.

456. Letter to Mr. David Burgess, deputing him to settle certain disputes in Sandwíp. July 7.

457. Letter from Major Crawford, in charge of the Collections at Jhálidá, reporting having restored the Zamíndárí of Jeriá to tranquillity, and apprehended a gang of robbers; and recommending that the inhabitants of the Districts under him, as also in Pánchet and part of Rámgarh, be deprived of their arms. July 3.

458. Letter from Major Crawford, requesting instructions respecting the Settlement of Jhálidá. July 24.

459. Letter to Major Crawford, in reply, directing him to enter upon the Settlement immediately. July 24.

460. Letter from Mr. John Evelyn, enclosing five petitions for the joint

farming of Rájsháhi for three years, at a rental (Jamá) of eight Lákhs. July 3.

461. Letter to Mr. Evelyn, in reply, authorizing him to accept the above proposal if a higher rental (Jamá) cannot be obtained. July 3.

462. Letter from Mr. Evelyn, regarding the plan of settlement he proposes adopting for Bhitaria and Nadiyá. July 17. Authorized.

463. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing letter from Mr. M'Cullum, on the subject of the order for the removal of the private factories in the Lakshmípur District. July 3.

464. Letter to Governor-General, etc., regarding the disputes between the Commercial Chief of Lakshmípur and the Farmer of Bhuluá. July 7.

465. Letter from Governor-General, etc., proposing a plan for preventing Chiefs and Collectors from accruing balances in future. July 10.

466. Letter from Governor-General, etc., transmitting petition from Rájá Nabákrishná, claiming two villages in Nadiyá. July 24.

467. Letter to Governor-General, etc., transmitting copy of the award respecting the disputes between the Governor of Serampur and the Zamíndárs of Muhammadámínpur. July 24.

468. Letter to Collector of Huglí, respecting the sums to be paid for the maintenance of French and Dutch prisoners. July 3.

469. Letter from Collector of Huglí, regarding the oppressions exercised by the Zamíndár of Muhammadámínpur upon the Tálukdár of Hásbáríá. July 10.

470. Letter from Mr. Henry Lodge, reporting having settled the dispute between the Commercial Chief at Lakshmípur and the Farmer of Bhuluá. July 7.

471. Letter to Chief of Murshidábád, transmitting him copy of complaints preferred by sundry Tálukdárs and Renters of his District, and of the resolutions passed on them. July 28.

472. Letter from Mr. Bernard M'Cullum, on the order of the Honourable Board for the removal of private Factories from the vicinity of Lakshmípur, requesting to be allowed some time to settle his affairs. July 3.

473. Letter from Mr. M'Dowall, on the present state of the District of Dinájpur, and the cause of the decrease of Revenue; reporting the measures taken for restoring it, and requesting an additional number of Sepoys. July 17.

474. Letter to Mr. M'Dowall, recommending despatch in concluding the Settlement of his District. July 17.

475. Letter from Mr. J. D. Paterson, proposing that some of the persons apprehended for having been concerned in the late insurrections should be released to quiet the minds of the people. July 3.

476. Letter to Mr. Paterson, directing him not to release the prisoners in question, but to keep them in custody until further orders. July 3.

477. Letter from Assistant at 24 Parganás, reporting progress in settling the District. July 21.

478. Letter from Collector of Pánchet, recommending a Khás settlement of his District. July 7. Authorized.

479. Order (Parwáná) to the Fort Revenue Collector (Sazáwal) of Bishnupur, regarding the account settlement of his District. July 7.

480. Order (Parwáná) to the Zamíndár of Lashkarpur, regarding the complaint of the Tálukdár of Maidpur against him. July 10.

481. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh, desiring to know his opinion respecting the propriety of obliging the inhabitants of the eastern parts of his District to relinquish their offensive weapons. July 3.

482. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, reporting having concluded the Settlement of Rangpur and Ghorághát for 1190, at a rental (Jamá) of Rs. 8,99,077, 3 : 5 : 4. July 31.

483. Letter from Mr. John Shore, Acting President, reporting on the account settlement of Bishnupur, as prepared by the Sazáwal, or Government Revenue Agent. July 7.

484. Letter from Collector of Sálbárís, reporting that the settlement has been concluded with the late Farmer for three years, at the rental (Jamá) of last year. July 10.

485. Letter from Mr. Charles Sealy, representing the loss that would be occasioned to him by enforcing the order for abolishing private Factories, and requesting the interposition of the Committee in his favour. July 21.

486. Letter from Resident at Tipperah, reporting the death of the Rájá, and requesting orders respecting the successor. July 28.

487. Letter to Resident of Tipperah, in reply, directing that the Rání be acknowledged successor for the present, and that if this should be disputed, the succession should be determined by the Court (Adálat). July 28.

488. Letter from Mr. Henry Vansittart, reporting progress regarding

the settlement of Nadiyá, and proposing to farm out the District for one year. July 3. Approved.

## AUGUST, 1783.

489. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, in answer to the complaints of the Zamíndár of Dinájpur. August 11.

490. Petition from Inhabitants of Pánchet, complaining of oppression on the part of the Zamíndár. August 14.

491. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, giving an account of a Madrasá or Muhammadan School, formerly established at Bhágalpur. August 7.

492. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, informing him of the abolition of the Militia Corps, and the establishment of a Sibandí Corps in lieu of it. August 25.

493. Letter from Mr. S. Charters, delivering in an abstract of the complaints of the cultivators (rayats) of Bírbhúm. August 11.

494. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, enclosing copies of regulations issued by the Honourable Board, for the purpose of preserving good order and tranquillity in the Provinces. August 25.

495. Letter to Chief of Dacca, authorizing him to pay the usual Nizámat allowances to Nawáb Kismat Jang. August 14.

496. Letter to Mr. John Dynely, appointing him to make the Settlement of Midnapur. August 18.

497. Letter from Mr. John Evelyn, complaining of oppressions exercised in Rájsháhi by people belonging to the Nawáb and Mr. Christie, in seizing boats by violence and loading them with goods for Calcutta. August 4.

498. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, respecting the lessened consequence of his present station owing to his power being circumscribed, and his very limited charge of collections; requesting that the city and environs of Murshidábád may be placed under his authority, and that the amount of his collections may be made equal to that of his disbursements, etc., in order to make his official situation respectable. August 18.

499. Order (Parwáná) to the Sazáwul of Bishnúpur, directing him to lay before the Committee the causes of the decrease in the revenue (Jamá) of that District. August 11.

500. Letter from Michael de Rozio, proposing to purchase the whole of the Company's Opium during the years 1783-'84 and '85, at

Rs. 430 per chest for that of Behar, and Rs. 275 per chest for that of Bengal. August 18.

501. Minute by Mr. John Shore, proposing to submit to the Honourable Board, for their approbation, some additional Regulations relating to rent-free lands. August 18.

502. Letter from Mr. H. Vansittart, at Nadiyá, recommending that the sum of Rs. 25,000 per annum be appropriated out of the Rájá's Múshárará, or monthly allowance, for the support of his relations. August 14. Approved.

## SEPTEMBER, 1783.

503. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, in reply to the charges preferred against him by Mr. Paterson, in that gentleman's report on the disturbances in Rangpur. September 23.

504. Letter from Resident at Bhográi regarding the depredations committed by the Chuárs, the hillmen of Western Bengal, in sundry Tarafs of his District, and requesting the assistance of a complete company of Sepoys to put an effectual stop to them. September 22. Authorized.

505. Letter from Commissioner of Bardwán, respecting the conduct of the Rájá of Bardwán, and of the interference of his relations in public business. September 29.

506. Letter to Commissioner of Bardwán, in reply, directing him to desire the Rájá to return immediately to Bardwán, and to inform him that on his non-compliance, the charge of the business will be given to the Agents (Mutsaddís) independent of his control. September 29.

507. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, reporting having concluded the Settlement of Chittagong and Tipperah. September 11.

508. Letter from Major Crawford, transmitting Account Settlement and Kistbandís of Jhálidá for the current year. September 25. Approved.

509. Letter from the Díwán, with his report on the complaints preferred by the Tálukdárs of Jalálpur. September 4.

510. Letter from Governor-General and Council, declining to accept Mr. de Rozio's proposal for the purchase of the Opium. September 1.

511. Letter from Governor-General, etc., regarding the present state of the Behar Province, and necessity for some speedy arrangements being made with respect to it. September 15.

512. Letter from Governor-General, etc., submitting to the Board an account of the Jágirs in Behar; but as it cannot be depended upon in every point, suggesting the propriety of appointing a Commissioner for the express purpose of investigating the tenures of the alienated lands in that Province, and to inquire into abuses, the expense of which inquiry is to be defrayed by a Rusúm, or fee of 2 per cent. on the amount of such lands. September 15.

513. Letter from Governor-General, etc., authorizing the Committee to depute their Acting President to Patna, for the purpose of investigating the causes of the balances there, and making the new Settlement of the Behar Province, as well as to furnish information respecting the alienated lands. September 25.

514. Letter to Captain Gall, directing him to detach a company of Sepoys to Bhográi in Midnápur to act under the orders of the Resident there. September 22.

515. Letter to Mr. Dynely, directing him not to conclude the Settlement of Midnapur for a longer period than one year. September 22.

516. Letter from Mr. M'Dowall, enclosing an account settlement of Dinájpur for the Bengal year 1190, concluded at a Jamá of Rs. 1,312,679, exclusive of the sum of Rs. 203,050 suspended for future inquiry; but which, after the intended examination of the assets and resources of the District (Hastobúd), will probably be added to the Jamá. September 25.

517. Letter from Mr. J. D. Paterson, with further explanations respecting the causes of the insurrection in Rangpur, which he imputes solely to the undue exactions and oppressions of Rájá Debí Sinh. September 22.

518. Letter from Preparer of Reports, reporting on a complaint preferred against the Collector of Silhet and his officers on account of undue exactions. September 22.

519. Letter from Mr. John Shore, Acting President, respecting the present state of the Behar Province, and the necessity of deputing a person thither to investigate the nature of the balances, and make the necessary arrangements respecting the Settlement, offering his services for the above purposes. September 15.

520. Letter to Mr. Shore, authorizing his deputation to Patna. September 25.

521. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, reporting the alarming

prospect of a scarcity of grain from the failure of the periodical rains, and stating the measures he has taken for the purpose of preventing it. September 29.

522. Letter from Collector of Silhet, stating that the Zamíndárs of Parganá Dauadí having absented themselves for nine months without paying any revenue, he requests permission to sell their lands as an example to others. September 8.

523. Letter to Collector of Silhet, in reply, authorizing the sale, but directing that a publication be previously made, fixing a limited time for the Zamíndárs to return to their duty. September 8.

524. Letter from Mr. W. Taylor, Resident at Bírbhúm, transmitting Account Settlement and Kistbandi, or a statement of instalments of revenue, and the periods at which they are to be paid, of his District for 1190. September 15. Approved.

525. Letter from Mr. Taylor, in reply to the complaints preferred by the rayats of Bírbhúm. September 15.

526. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, representing the probability of an approaching scarcity from want of rain, and stating that he has in consequence prohibited the exportation of grain to the southward of the Ganges. September 22. The prohibition was withdrawn a few days afterwards, rain having fallen.

## OCTOBER, 1783.

527. Letter from Collector of Bhográi, reporting that the depredations in his District have ceased, and the ringleaders of the low caste men (Chuárs) gone into neighbouring Districts; suggesting the expediency of offering a reward for their apprehension. October 13. Approved.

528. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, stating that the Honourable Board have suspended the duties on grain transported to the upper countries for two months, and directing that orders to this effect be issued to all Zamíndárs, Tálukdárs, etc. October 6.

529. Circular Letter, directing the publication of certain orders for preventing an artificial scarcity of grain, etc., and requiring accounts of the consumption and exportation of grain in each District, etc. October 13.

530. Circular Letter, directing publication of the Board's orders, recorded this day, respecting the Famine in the Wazír's dominions; direct-

ing that exact lists be transmitted to the Committee of the number of people who may come to settle in the several Districts, with an account of the land given them and of the advances required for its cultivation; and ordering that any person stopping or collecting duties on grain be sent down as a prisoner to Calcutta. October 16.

531. Circular Letter, ordering publication of Messrs. Graham, Cumming, Law, and Templars' appointment as Commissioners to superintend and regulate the sale, distribution, and price of grain. October 20.

532. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, repeating the orders already issued respecting the free exportation of grain, and directing them to correspond with the Committee of grain, and to employ the officers of Government in any service relative to the present scarcity. October 27.

533. Letter to Chief of Dacca, directing him to inquire into the complaint of Rámjimal against the Zamíndár of Gangámandal, whom he is to send down under restraint to Calcutta, in case it should be proved that he has prevented the cultivators (rayats) from paying their rents to the Farmer. October 23.

534. Letter from the Díwán, representing that Jagannáth Basu, who has been confined at the Khálsá for four or five years on account of arrears of Revenue, is very ill. October 16. Release ordered.

535. Letter from Mr. John Evelyn, forwarding account settlement of Rájsháhi for 1190 Bengal era. October 16.

536. Letter from Governor-General and Council, forbidding the granting of Mukarrarí or fixed leases. October 9.

537. Letter to Governor-General, etc., reporting the disturbances by the low caste men (Chuárs) in Bhográi, and the refractory conduct of several Zamíndárs in the west of Midnapur. October 13.

538. Letter to Governor-General, etc., reporting the measures taken by Mr. Shore for the relief of the Behar inhabitants, and recommending that gentleman to be invested with full authority during the present scarcity of grain. October 27. Approved.

539. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, enclosing a Jamá Wásil Bákí (*i.e.* a statement showing the assessed revenue, the amount realized, and balance still due) account of Balrámpur, with the Police Officer's (Thánádár's) report on violences and depredations committed by Sundar Náráin Durjan Sinh, Morbhanj

Rájá, and others; and stating that Sepoys are required to assist the Thánádár in the collections. October 13.

540. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, in reply, stating that the Committee have applied for a battalion of Sepoys, which, in quelling the Balrámpur disturbances, are also to co-operate in seizing Chhatra Sinh, and other insurgents in Bhográi, for the apprehension of whom a reward is offered. October 13.

541. Letter from Deputy-Governor of the Orphan Society, applying for a piece of ground situated at Dakshíneswar, south of Calcutta, for the purpose of erecting a building for the children and orphans of non-commissioned officers and private soldiers. October 16.

542. Letter from Mr. J. D. Paterson, replying to several questions put to him by the Committee regarding the late insurrection in Rangpur. October 20.

543. Letter from Collector of Purniah, respecting the dearth and scarcity of grain in his District. October 13.

544. Letter from Collector of Purniah, stating that the orders sent him on the 30th ult., respecting the scarcity of grain, being liable to cause a greater distress in the District, he has suspended its publication, and prohibited the exportation of grain. October 20. Referred to circular orders on the subject, October 20.

545. Letter to Collector of Purniah, directing him to withdraw any orders that may tend to prevent the free exportation of grain. October 27.

546. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, remarking on the heavy balances outstanding in the District, and the distress for want of rain; and stating that a suspension of revenue is expected by the Zamíndár, etc. October 6.

547. Letter from the Secretary to the General Department, accompanying Minutes of the Supreme Council respecting the famine experienced in the Wazír's Provinces; and as it will draw many of the inhabitants of those countries into the Company's Dominions, the Board direct that they be provided with unoccupied land for their residence; prohibiting the collection of any kind of duty on grain, and prohibiting its transportation by sea. October 16.

548. Minute by Mr. John Shore, on Mr. Paterson's Report relative to the late Insurrection in Rangpur. October 6.

549. Letter to Mr. John Shore, approving of the measures taken by him in Patna, and investing him with full authority for the relief of

the inhabitants of Behar; directing him to report all his measures to the Committee of Grain, and to attend to directions from the Committee. October 30.

550. Letter to Collector of Sarkár Sáran, disapproving of the interruption given to the free exportation of grain, and directing obedience to Mr. Shore's orders relative to any measures he may take during the present scarcity. October 27.

551. Letter from Mr. W. Taylor, in Bírbhúm, reporting on the scarcity of grain owing to the severe drought. October 13.

## NOVEMBER, 1783.

552. Petition from Tálukdárs of Sandwíp, complaining of the Zamíndár selling their lands, and demanding increase of rent; and requesting deductions be made from their rent on account of lands washed away by the sea. November 24.

553. Petition from the cultivators (rayats) of the 24 Parganás, representing that they are likely to be great sufferers by the present drought. November 24.

554. Letter to Commissioner of Bardwán, desiring him to afford assistance to the Process Clerk (Nazir) of the Khálsá, who has been despatched with a writ (dastak) to summon the Rájá of Bardwán to the Presidency. November 17.

555. Letter from Mr. Samuel Charters, Acting President, acquainting the Committee that the Rájá of Bardwán has left that place, accompanied by the discontented members of his family, on pretence of performing some religious ceremonies at Bánsbáriá, and which he represents will greatly endanger the collections. November 6.

556. Letter from Mr. Charters, reporting having received a letter from the Rájá of Bardwán, expressing his sorrow at having incurred the Committee's displeasure, and promising strict attention to the business of the revenue, etc., and requesting that his attendance in Calcutta may be dispensed with. November 27. Agreed to.

557. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing an Account Settlement of his District for 1190, Bengal era. November 13.

558. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, directing a Mufassal investigation of the quantity of grain now in deposit, and of the state of the crops, comparatively with the produce of former

years; and requesting an account of the grain in store in every village, etc. November 13.

559. Letter to Díwán, directing him to report on Báránasi Ghosh's claim to deduction on account of lands appropriated for the Budge Budge (Baj Baj) Fort. November 10.

560. Letter from Governor-General and Council, stating that, on a reconsideration of the reciprocal claims of the Rájá of Nepál and Mirzá Abdullá, respecting the Jágír of Parganás Rothal and Pashrautá, the orders issued in favour of the latter have been repealed. November 17.

561. Letter from Governor-General, etc., desiring the Committee to report on the relations of the Morbhanj Rájá with this and the Orissa Government, and as to what means should be adopted for preventing his disturbing the Company's Districts. November 24.

562. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, enclosing copy of his address to the Committee of Grain, stating that the Jaleswar and Midnapur Districts will be able to maintain themselves, but not to afford any large quantity for exportation. November 6.

563. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Bardwán, requesting his immediate return to that place, from whence he is to be brought down to Calcutta, and stating that he will be divested of the charge of his Zamíndárí should he not exclude from all public concerns the discontented members of his family. November 6.

564. Order (Parwáná) to the Farmer of Purniah, authorizing him to collect the usual taxes on grain sold in Bázárs. November 13.

565. Letter from Collector of Purniah, stating that by allowing an unlimited exportation of grain, the District will be exposed to danger. November 6.

566. Letter to Collector of Purniah, enclosing a petition from the Farmer respecting his being prohibited to collect a tax upon grain, and observing that the abolition of duties extends only to those collected by the Board of Customs. November 13.

567. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, stating that owing to the severe drought felt in the District, the Collections will greatly suffer. November 27.

568. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, informing him of directions issued for apprehending gang robbers, or dákáits, of Idrakpur who have attacked Parganá Patásan, and desiring him to acquaint the Zamíndár of Idrakpur that he will be held responsible for any loss in the Revenue. November 3.

569. Letter from Collector of Silhet, reporting disturbances raised by the Khasiás, a hill people of Assam, owing to the ill-treatment met with by one of their tribe from an officer (Háwáldár) of Sepoys; requesting to be furnished with arms and ammunition, and suggesting the propriety of building a block house and a mud wall at Thaná Panduá for the protection of the country. November 10.

570. Letter to Captain Williams, directing him to furnish the Díwán of Dinájpur with Sepoys for apprehending gang robbers (dákáits) who are committing excesses in Parganá Patásan. November 3.

## DECEMBER, 1783.

571. Petition from the Zamíndár of Dinájpur, tendering for holding his Zamíndárí at a fixed and perpetual settlement. December 4. Accepted.

572. Petition from the Farmer of Sálbáris, requesting to be allowed to make his collections without the interference of the Collector; that he may sell lands of Zamíndárs in Balances; and distribute proportionately the increase laid on the District in 1188, Bengal era. December 8.

573. Letter to Commissioner of Bardwán, informing him that as the Rájá of Bardwán has complied with the orders sent to him, the Committee has dispensed with the order requiring his presence at the Presidency. December 1.

574. Letter from Mr. S. Charters, informing the Committee of a request made by the Zamíndár of Rájsháhi for remissions on account of the last and the present year. December 29.

575. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, prohibiting them from allowing any deductions on account of drought. December 29.

576. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, enclosing an extract from the Honourable Board's orders respecting the removal of all Europeans, not Company's servants, from the country, and for the abolition of all private Factories. December 29.

577. Letter from the Committee of Grain, recommending the encouragement of the cultivation of wheat, as the means of procuring future alleviation of distress, in cases of apprehended scarcity of rice. December 1.

578. Letter from Major Crawford, reporting that the rebellious people

of Tomár, being unable to make any resistance, had surrendered themselves on condition only that they should not be delivered over to the Criminal (Fauzdárí) Court for trial for past depredations. He had consented to this condition, as the object of Government was only to ensure the tranquillity of the District, and had directed the people to demolish the numerous strongholds which they had erected, and to return the plunder taken from adjoining countries. December 8.

579. Letter to Governor-General in Council, requesting orders regarding the disturbances by the Morbhanj Rájá. December 1.

580. Letter from Governor-General, etc., regarding proposals of the Dinájpur Zamíndár for holding his own Zamíndárí under a fixed and perpetual settlement. Proposal accepted. Jamá payable at the Khálsá, Rs. 1,275,968 10 an. 12 gandás 2 karás. December 4.

581. Letter to Governor-General in Council, reporting the death of Dhairjendra Náráyan Rája of Kuch Behar, and of the measures taken to secure the Revenues, and to prevent quarrels on account of the succession. December 15.

582. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing the Committee to advertise that a discount of four per cent. will be allowed on the last Opium sales, if the lots be cleared and paid for before the 25th inst. December 18.

583. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing the Committee to open a correspondence with Rájá Rám Pandit for concerting a plan of joint hostilities against the Morbhanj Rájá; also directing that no pleas on account of drought be admitted, and approving of the Behar Settlement concluded by Mr. Shore. December 29.

584. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that the order for the removal of all Europeans, not Company's servants, from the country, and of all private Factories, be carried into execution with the utmost rigour. December 29.

585. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, stating that the Morbhanj Rájá assists the Bhográi Rájá against the Company's Troops, and that he is raising a force in Hariápur to attack the Company's Districts; adding that Rájá Rám Pandit is endeavouring with an army to reduce him. December 1.

586. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, sending an Account Settlement of Jaleswar and Midnapur for 1191. December 11. Approved.

587. Letter from Mr. J. D. Paterson, stating that in the late insurrection in Rangpur, the cultivators (rayats) were driven to desperation by the oppressions of, and uncustomary taxes levied by, Rájá Debí Sinh, etc. etc. December 29.

588. Letter from Collector of Pánchet, reporting that he has apprehended the wife, daughter, and mother-in-law of the Zamíndár of Bhográi, and also the wife and daughter of his son, Chhatra Sinh. December 15.

589. Order (Parwáná) for the apprehension of village watchmen (Chaukídárs) of Bozargomedpur, for having collected duty on grain. December 1.

590. Letter from Chief of Purniah, informing the Committee that in consequence of requisitions from the Collector of Bhagalpur, he has issued orders for buying on the public account 20,000 maunds of rice. December 1.

591. Letter to Chief of Purniah, in reply, informing him that as the Committee have received no orders for appropriating any part of the revenue to the purchase of grain, they cannot authorize the above purchase. December 1.

592. Letter from Chief of Purniah, enclosing letter to him from the Committee of Grain, directing him to purchase rice on the public account. December 18.

593. Letter from Mr. John Shore, enclosing account of the Settlement of 1191, Faslí era, for the Districts of Patna, Tirhut, and for part of Behar; and stating that he will shortly lay before the Committee a statement of the balances of the Behar Province in general. December 18.

## JANUARY, 1784.

594. Letter from Resident at Bhográi, enclosing correspondence with Major Vanas on the subject of his progress in repressing the Chuárs; with a proposal of submission on the part of the eighteen ancient military chiefs (Náiks) of the country. January 8.

595. Letter to Resident at Bhográi, in reply, directing that the surrender of the eighteen chiefs (Náiks) be accepted, and that they be sent to Calcutta for a hearing of their complaints, etc.; also directing that a publication be issued, fixing a period for the surrender of Chhatra Sinh. January 8.

596. Letter from Chief of Dacca, representing that from the excessive

distress experienced by the inhabitants of Dacca, owing to the great exportation of grain from the District, he has been under the necessity of stopping all purchases. January 12.

597. Letter to Chief of Dacca, in reply, directing him to take off any restraint he may have put on the exportation of grain; to make inquiries where any grain is deposited, and cause the same to be brought to market. January 12.

598. Letter to Governor-General in Council, respecting damages done by the Gumti, and requesting permission to disburse the amount required for the repair of the embankments. December 5. Disbursement sanctioned, January 12.

599. Letter to Governor-General in Council, forwarding Mr. Paterson's report respecting the late insurrection in Rangpur, together with the Committee's proceedings and observations on the subject. January 27.

600. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, representing that, owing to Captain Hamilton's battalions being ordered to Bhográi, the Districts bordering on the Marhattá and the Morbhanj country remain unprotected, and stating that the Morbhanj Rájá will take advantage of this to become more refractory. January 22.

601. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, in reply, stating that the service of troops in Bhográi will only be a temporary one, and directing him to preserve the peace of the country as far as in his power, until the measures to be adopted against the Morbhanj Rájá have been decided on. January 22.

602. Letter from Chief of Purniah, recommending indulgences in collecting the revenue from the rayats of certain Parganás, who complain that notwithstanding the drought, the Farmer persists in demanding revenue from them. January 8.

603. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, reporting that, except in a small part of the Rájsháhi District, the drought has not been severely felt, and the price of grain has been moderate. January 12.

604. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, enclosing a representation from the Amín deputed to inquire into the disturbances at Patásan, from which it appeared that the party employed in seizing the Deputy (Náib) and others of Lálbágh had greatly alarmed the country by their violent conduct. January 5.

605. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, directing him to cause the release of the Patásan people (rayats) confined in Idrakpur, and to take

effectual measures to prevent future disturbances between the people of Lálbárí and Patásan. January 22.

606. Letter from Secretary to the General Department, informing the Committee of the Board's orders respecting advances to be made to the Committee of Grain, for the purpose of erecting granaries in different parts of the country. January 5.

607. Letter from Secretary to the General Department, stating that the Board have granted a spot of ground at Dakshíneswar, south of Calcutta, to the Orphan Society, for the purpose of erecting buildings. January 8.

608. Letter from Mr. John Shore, enclosing a statement of the demands upon Rájá Kalián Sinh on account of the years 1188, 1189, and 1190 Faslí, which, after bringing to account his public allowances and adjusting his claims upon Government, etc., leaves his balance at Rs. 570,295 : 12 : 0; for the liquidation of which a settlement has been concluded of his free tenure (Jagírs), and of Mitrajit Sinh's Málikáná lands already attached on account of his debt to Kalián Sinh, by which means the whole of the balances will be discharged in five years. January 8. Instructions on the foregoing forwarded to Mr. Shore.

609. Letter from Collector of Silhet, representing that any investigation of the deposits and produce of grain in his District would be attended with no good results, and offering as a proof of there being plenty of grain in his District, to provide Government with three lákhs of maunds in the course of two months. January 5.

## FEBRUARY, 1784.

610. Petition from the Farmer of Purniah, reporting on depredations committed by the inhabitants of Sikim (Morang). February 2.

611. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, regarding Mr. Paterson's Report. February 2.

612. Petition from Vakíl of Kuch Behar, complaining that the Názir Deo, whom Mr. Goodlad appointed lately to the management of the District, has confined and otherwise ill-treated the officers of the Rání, and is also keeping her under restraint. February 5.

613. Petition from the Farmers of Rájsháhi, praying that on account of the severe drought experienced in the District, the collections may not be made from them with severity. February 19.

614. Letter from Resident at Bhográi, enclosing copy of a letter from

Captain Hamilton, who reports that, notwithstanding the late proclamation, no insurgents have surrendered themselves, and that the Zamíndár of Simlápál greatly encourages the people (rayats), etc.; requesting orders (Párwánas) to several Zamíndárs directing them to co-operate in the reduction of the insurgents; also forwarding copy of Captain Hamilton's correspondence on the subject of an intimation from the Commander-in-Chief to reduce the strength of the troops now in Bhográi. February 5.

615. Letter to Resident at Bhográi, desiring him to direct Captain Hamilton to seize the Zamíndár of Simlápál and deliver him over to the Criminal (Faujdari) Court for trial, and to act in like manner with any other Zamíndár giving protection to the insurgents; enclosing orders (Parwánás) required, etc. February 5.

616. Letter from Resident at Bhográi, stating that on the death of Rájá Jadu Sinh, he allowed his widow and daughter Rs. 100 and two pieces of cloth for celebrating his obsequies (Sráddha). February 16.

617. Letter from Resident at Bhográi, enclosing copy of a letter from Captain Hamilton, intimating his intention of attacking the insurgents of Bhográi in their retreat at Káliápál; reporting an intercession on behalf of Chhatra Sinh, whose past conduct was attributed to the bad advice of Jadu Sinh and his adherents; and suggesting the propriety of restoring Taraf Bhilá for the maintenance of himself and his mother. February 23.

618. Letter to Resident at Bhográi, in reply, desiring him to give directions to Captain Hamilton to attack the insurgents in Káliápál, or in any other District to which they may retire; authorizing him at the same time to receive the submission of those who are desirous of returning to obedience, except from Kosil Pátra, Nadan Digwar, and Bhág Rai; approving of proposition in favour of Chhatra Sinh. January 23.

619. Letter to Chief of Dacca, enclosing copy of representations from the Zamíndárs of Maimansinh, and directing him to expel Sháh Masrí and his Fakírs or Muhammadan ascetics from the District. February 5.

620. Letter to Governor-General and Council, enclosing two petitions from the Vakíls of Kuch Behar, and stating that the District being a tributary one, the Committee doubts whether it has any authority to interfere in the matter without the express order of the Honourable Board; also stating that an inquiry is being

made respecting the laws of succession in Kuch Behar, the result of which will be laid before the Board. February 5.

621. Letter from Mr. Tilman Henckell, enclosing copy of letter to him from Mr. Webber, containing the resolutions of the Honourable Board, on a plan laid before it by him for clearing the Sundarbans, and submitting an establishment of servants required for conducting the business. February 19.

622. Letter from Collector, enclosing copy of his answers to a circular letter received from the Committee of Grain. February 2.

623. Letter to Chief of Patna, directing him to advance Captain Garstin any sum he may require for erecting public granaries. February 2.

624. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhi, enclosing petitions from the Farmers of Rájsháhi, directing him to furnish such information as will enable the Committee to decide upon their claims for remission on account of drought, etc. February 19.

625. Letter from Mr. John Shore, forwarding accounts of the alienated lands in the Behar Province, amounting in all to an annual produce of 1,308,786 rupees 11 annas 8 gandás; stating the nature of the several grants under which free lands are held in Behar, and proposing a plan and regulation for an office to be instituted for the investigation and registry of the grants in Behar. February 5.

626. Letter from Mr. J. Shore, accompanying Account Settlement concluded by him for Sarkár Saran and Champáran. February 5.

627. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Saran, with a price current of grain in his District. February 2 and 19.

628. Letter from Collector of Silhet, stating that he has ordered all Europeans, not Company's servants, to quit the District. February 12.

## MARCH, 1784.

629. Petition from the Farmer of Purniah, reporting that Banodar Cholsi, on the part of the Rájá of Nepal, has possessed himself of a fort on the borders of the country, and committed several depredations; requesting that Captain Williams may be ordered to expel him from the District. March 15.

630. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, enclosing copy of a letter from the Governor-General in Council in the Political Depart-

ment; and directing them to survey and report the actual possessions held by France in each of their respective Districts anterior to the late war. March 22.

631. Letter to Chief of Dacca, directing him to cause the Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs of his Division to attend at the principal treasury (Khálsá) for the purpose of concluding their Settlements for 1191, and to inform them that those who are in arrears on account of the present year will be excluded from holding their estates, and the lands will be sold to liquidate their balances. March 18.

632. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing a letter and proposal from Mr. Henckell, which has been accepted, to be permitted to open a canal of communication between the Bhairab and Kabadak rivers, and to collect a toll upon all boats, etc. for five years. March 4.

633. Letter to Governor-General in Council, respecting the right of succession to the State of Kuch Behar, and of the contentions respecting the management of the District, and the education of the infant Rájá. March 8.

634. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing petition of Ibadulla Khán, Zamíndár of Amrábád, requesting that the Settlement for the Bengal year 1191 may be made with him. March 8.

635. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of a complaint from the Greeks, claiming an indemnification for losses sustained by interruptions, from the Collector of Silhet, in their trade in lime (Chunám). March 18.

636. Letter from Governor-General in Council, referring four petitions to the Committee, viz.—one from the widow of the late Zamíndár of Bírbhúm, complaining of Bahádur Zamán Khán's being unjustly invested with the management of the District; another from Madan Mohan, requesting that the Zamíndárí of nine anas share of Tamluk may be granted him on his paying a revenue of Rs. 63,467 : 12 for the Wíláyatí year 1190, and a Nazráná, or investiture fee of Rs. 15,000; the third from Rádhá Krishna Basu, Krishna Prasád, and Srí Náth Nág, offering a revenue of Rs. 210,721 for the Bengal year 1190, and an investiture fee (Nazráná) of Rs. 20,000 for the Zamíndárí of Azimábád in the 24 Parganás; and the last from Gobind Prasád Mitra, offering a revenue of Rs. 8301 for 1190, and a Nazráná of

Rs. 9301 for the Zamíndárí of Sultánábád in Bhágalpur. March 18.

637. Letter from Governor-General in Council, forwarding accounts showing the increase and the decrease in the revenues (Jamá) of Rangpur for the Bengal years 1188, 1189, and 1190, with observations on the remission of Rs. 140,960 : 10 : 12 allowed by the Collector on the settlement of 1190, on account of Dirinwálá (?) of 1188 and 1189, accompanied by an explanation given by Rájá Debí Sinh, of the mode in which, as he asserts, the taxes of Dirinwálá, etc. were assessed by the Zamíndárs on the cultivators (rayats), with the Committee's remarks on the existence of these taxes in 1188 and 1189, and the incongruity of remitting them in 1190. March 25.

638. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating the receipt of His Majesty's Royal Proclamation of the Peace concluded with France and Spain, and directing the Committee to report on the actual possessions held by France in Bengal and Orissa anterior to the present war, that they may be restored agreeably to the 13th Article of the Treaty of Peace. March 22.

639. Letter from Collector of Huglí, reporting having published an order forbidding any anticipation in the coming year's revenue. March 1.

640. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, enclosing a price current of grain in his District. March 22.

641. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, submitting the propriety of being invested with control over the agent in charge of the embankments, to enable him to make such representations as will prevent groundless complaints being made by the Nawáb and the inhabitants of Murshidábád. March 25.

642. Order (Parwáná) to Názir Deo, acquainting him of Captain Williams having been ordered to proceed to Kuch Behar, and directing him to deliver over the late Rájá's house to the Ráni and her son. March 4.

643. Order (Parwáná) to Rájá Debí Sinh, requiring him to explain in what manner and by whose orders the taxes in Dirinwálá, etc. were assessed in Rangpur in 1188 and 1189. March 22.

644. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, stating that the crop has seriously failed, and recommending the suspension of the ensuing kist (instalment) to prevent the Farmer from oppressing the rayats. March 22.

645. Letter to Collector of Silhet, enclosing copy of a complaint from the Greeks, and directing him to allow them free trade in Silhet, and to procure them an indemnification for any loss they may have sustained from interruptions. March 15.

646. Letter to Mr. Henry Vansittart, authorizing him to conclude the Settlement of Nadiyá for one year, with a clause that the lease is to be continued from year to year until the revenues are regularly paid. March 1.

647. Letter to Captain Williams, directing him to proceed to Kuch Behar, to afford the Rání and her son protection from any violences from Názir Deo, and to put them in possession of the late Rájá's house; also requiring him to report on the causes of the present disputes. March 4.

## APRIL, 1784.

648. Petition from the Zamíndár of Rájsháhi, with her proposal for farming the District. April 1.

649. Petition from Farmer of Purniah, reporting that owing to the drought it will be necessary to advance Takávi of Rs. 60,000 to the cultivators (rayats). April 1.

650. Petition from Vakíl of Rájsháhi, enclosing a proposal from the Rání to farm her District for four years, paying twenty-four lákhs of rupees for the Bengal year 1191, and an annual progressive increase of Rs. 25,000 for the succeeding three years. April 15.

651. Petition from the Rájá of Bardwán, enclosing a remittance for Rs. 60,000 on account of his balances, and requesting that the Process Officer (Názir) and peons placed over him be recalled. April 26.

652. Letter from Rájá Debí Sinh, stating that information has reached him that the Chief of Murshidábád has directed an inventory to be taken of the effects in his house, and requesting that the apartments of his women may be exempted from the order. April 26.

653. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, directing them to issue a publication forbidding the Sepoys from collecting any allowance money (Battá) when employed in enforcing payment of the revenues. April 12.

654. Letter to Díwán, directing him to prepare the necessary deeds of Settlement to be signed by the Vakíl of the Rání of Rájsháhi. April 15.

655. Letter to Mr. John Evelyn, requesting him to proceed to Dacca for concluding the Settlement of 1191. April 15.

656. Letter to Collector of Fathi Sinh, directing him to keep the Farmer in confinement until he discharges his balances, and to acquaint him that in default of payment he will be sent a prisoner to the Khálsá and his lease annulled. April 1.

657. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that Rájá Debí Sinh be immediately confined in the Ḳhálsá, and that his property be secured; also directing that a Commission be appointed to make a further inquiry into the late disturbances at Rangpur, etc. April 5.

658. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that the payment of Lord Clive's Jágír is to cease on the 5th May 1784, as per orders from the Honourable Court of Directors. April 12.

659. Letter to Governor-General in Council, reporting that Rání Sarbeswarí was dismissed from the Zamíndárí of Sultánábád in 1780 on account of her being concerned in robberies committed in Bírbhúm by people of her Parganá, and that Gobind Prasád Mitra had applied to have the Zamíndárí vested in him. April 15.

660. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing copy of Captain Williams' letter, and remarking that the succession to Kuch Behar indisputably devolves upon the late Rájá's son; and the Board have only to decide whether the management of the District is to be vested in the Rání or in the Názir Deo, and if in the latter, that a suitable provision be made for the Rání and her family, and that Názir Deo's son be divested of the title of Jubaráj or Náib Rájá. April 19.

661. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing abstract settlement of Midnapur, Jaleswar, and Sarkár Sáran. April 29.

662. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that Messrs. Gole, Broughton, and Douglas have been appointed a Commission for making a further investigation into the disturbances in Rangpur. April 29.

663. Letter from Mr. T. Henckell, enclosing a plan relative to the cultivation of the Sundarbans, with particulars of their boundaries, and an estimate of the revenue likely to accrue to Government at the expiration of seven years, from the cultivation of 600,000 Bighás of ground, which he calculates at seven lákhs of rupees per year; submitting the propriety of collecting

himself (till a local survey can be made) the revenue of such lands within the said boundaries as may hereafter appear to be the property of individuals; and to prevent the Zamíndárs from levying improper taxes upon persons trading in wood, wax, honey, and chunam, he requests that these collections be placed under him, or that the duties thereon be abolished as an encouragement to new settlers; and also requesting that orders (Parwánás) may be issued to the Zamíndárs respecting his authority to grant leases (Pattás), etc. April 12.

664. Letter to Mr. Henckell, in reply, transmitting him the orders (Parwánás) requested by him, and informing him that complaints from any Zamíndárs respecting lands included in the above boundaries will be submitted to him. April 29.

665. Letter to Mr. Peter Moore, directing him to form a settlement for Rangpur for 1191, and to raise the assessment (Jamá) to the standard of the Bengal year 1187. April 19.

666. Orders (Parwánás) to the Rání of Rájsháhi, informing her that her proposals for farming the District are accepted. April 1.

667. Writ (Dastak) issued to the Process Clerk (Názir), directing him to confine Rájá Debí Sinh at the Khálsá. April 7.

668. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, enclosing copy of his letter to the Committee of Grain on the subject of the scarcity in the Districts under his charge. April 2.

669. Letter from Captain Williams, reporting that on his arrival at Kuch Behar he found the Rání and the infant Rájá living in personal safety in the late Rájá's house, under the protection of a guard placed there by Mr. Goodlad; stating that the Rání's complaints may be exaggerated, but that Názir Deo gave great cause for dissatisfaction, particularly by the appointment of his son as Náib Rájá, and by leaving the Rání without any provision for her support, etc. April 19.

## MAY, 1784.

670. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, requesting to be furnished with a copy of the instructions given to the Rangpur Commissioners, and soliciting that on his giving security for his appearance he may be allowed to attend them, so as to be on the spot to answer all complaints. May 3.

671. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, stating the refractory conduct

of Ján Bakhsh, and submitting a plan for excluding him from all communication with the low country, accompanied with an historical account of the Jumiás or Hill people. May 6.

672. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, in reply, approving of his plan, and recommending him to secure, by private means, the person of Ján Bakhsh, and also to state his opinion whether, by lenient means, the Hill people might be induced to become peaceable subjects and cultivators of the low lands. May 6.

673. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, enclosing copies of an advertisement inviting the natives of Bengal to trade with Thibet. May 28.

674. Letter to the Díwán, directing him to require Rájá Debí Sinh to inform the Committee of the name of any agent or Vakíl he may nominate to attend the Commissioners at Rangpur. May 13.

675. Letter to Governor-General and Council, stating that the proposed new settlement of Rájsháhi will afford an advantage to Government of Rs. 237,600. May 13.

676. Letter from Governor-General in Council, desiring that the infant Rájá of Kuch Behar be supported in his right to the succession, and requiring report of a person capable of managing the District during the Rájá's minority. May 13.

677. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting that the Zamíndár of Bhográi has voluntarily surrendered himself to Captain Hamilton, and that the Zamíndár of Kaliápál has been taken prisoner with all his family; requesting orders respecting the refractoriness of the Morbhanj Rájá and Captain Hamilton's return to his station at Jaleswár. May 6.

678. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, in reply, expressing satisfaction at Captain Hamilton's success, directing that the Kaliápál Zamíndár be kept in confinement, and informing the Collector that the Board has written to Rájá Rám Pandit at Cattak respecting the Morbhanj Rájá. May 6.

679. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, reporting that the persons employed in attaching Rájá Debí Sinh's property were particularly enjoined that no indignity should be shown to the Rájá's family; stating that he has put a stop to the inventory of the Rájá's effects, and requesting orders respecting the guard still remaining over his house. May 31.

680. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, reporting that the Districts under his charge are in a perfect state of tranquillity, and stating

that he has rejected all claims preferred on account of drought. May 6.

681. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, enclosing copy of a publication notifying to the inhabitants of the Rangpur District the appointment of a Commission deputed to inquire into the complaints against Rájá Debí Sinh, etc. May 31.

## JUNE, 1784.

682. Petition from Rámkánt Basu, complaining of oppression towards his tenants (rayats) by the Zamíndár of Rájsháhi. June 24.

683. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, representing his inability to raise money for paying balances demanded from him on account of Rangpur, requesting that security may be accepted, and the demand not enforced until his accounts and claims be decided on from the result of the Commissioners' inquiry, or that he may be allowed to attend the Commissioners under a guard. June 28.

684. Letter to Resident at Bhográi, authorizing him to pay Captain Hamilton's Sepoys the rewards published for apprehending ringleaders of the late insurrection, as soon as the state of his treasury will admit. June 4.

685. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, stating that the French never held any possessions in the Districts under his charge. June 10.

686. Letter to Mr. John Lewis Chauvet, Resident at Jaleswar, forwarding instructions respecting duties attached to his station; and pointing out the objects of his appointment in respect to disputed boundaries, and other matters, with the Marhattá Government. June 17.

687. Letter from Chief of Dacca, reporting the measurement of lands possessed by the French in the city of Dacca prior to the late war. June 10.

688. Letter to Governor-General and Council, transmitting information received respecting the possessions held by the French anterior to the late war. June 10.

689. Letter from Governor-General in Council, requiring to be furnished with copies of the different forms of occupancy (Amaldárí) and other deeds of Settlement, and of the orders for holding the Punyá, as have been issued by the Committee for the last and present year. June 10.

690. Letter to Governor-General in Council, in reply, enclosing copy of the papers required above, as also a copy of the deeds of Settlement executed by Mr. Shore for the Behar Province, which, having been approved of by the Honourable Board, the Committee intended should be considered as a rule for concluding the Settlement of the Bengal Districts. June 10.

691. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the general mode proposed by the Committee in their letter of the 12th April, with regard to concluding the new Settlement for 1191. June 17.

692. Letter from Collector of Huglí, enclosing extract of his proceedings on the subject of grain. June 4.

693. Letter from Collector of Huglí, reporting that the French held no other possessions in his District previous to the late war than Chandernagar. June 21.

694. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, enclosing copy of a petition from the cultivators (rayats) of Amarsi, Bhokámutá, and Bajrapur, respecting the inefficiency of the allowance made them for repairing the embankments (Puls), and complaining that the Zamíndár of Hijili, by neglecting the embankments of the river, exposes their lands to inundation; and also complaining of violences committed on their persons and property by the Zamíndár of Patáspur. June 17.

695. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, respecting price of grain in Midnapur and Jaleswar. June 21.

696. Letter from Collector of Pánchet, reporting that no possessions were ever held by the French in his District. June 21.

697. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, reporting the quantity of the ground held by the French in his District prior to the late war. June 21.

698. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, enclosing an Account Settlement and Kistbandi for the Bengal year 1191, showing an increase of Rs. 45,708 on the last year's assessment (Jamá). June 17.

699. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, enclosing a genealogical table of the Kuch Behar family, showing the surviving relations to the late Rájá, and explaining the nature of the offices of Názir Deo and Díwán Deo under that Government, etc.; stating that the present Názir Deo, who had assumed the management of the District and seized the Rájá's seal, is represented to be a man of intriguing disposition, whereas Kási Náth Sundar Náráin, the Díwán Deo, and Sarbánand Gosáin Guru, who have con-

cluded the present year's settlement, and whom the Ráni wishes to be entrusted with the management of her affairs during the nonage of the young Rájá, are persons who bear a fair and unexceptionable character. June 17.

700. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, in reply, desiring him to compel the Názir Deo to deliver up the Rájá's seal; and directing him to support the Ráni in the management of the District, and to employ only such people as she may appoint. June 17.

701. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, reporting that no possessions were held by France, previous to the late war, in the Districts under his jurisdiction. June 21.

702. Letter from Rangpur Commissioners, regarding their investigation into the late insurrection, and enclosing depositions of several cultivators (rayats) respecting the collection of Dirinwálá Báttá made in Rangpur by Rájá Debí Sinh, etc. June 10.

703. Letter from Rangpur Commissioners, expressing their apprehension that the investigation will become ineffectual if Rájá Debí Sinh be not permitted to attend them. June 14.

704. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, with price current of grain in Hijili District. June 4.

705. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, reporting that no possessions were ever held by the French in the Districts under his charge. June 10.

706. Letter from Collector of Silhet, enclosing list of some Parganás for which he recommends a deduction of Rs. 3300 on account of their impoverished state; reporting that the inundation of his District still continues. June 10.

## JULY, 1784.

707. Petition from the Farmer of Purniah, reporting that from the violence and oppressions exercised by the Zamíndár of Súrjyapur, as well as because of the arrears incurred by him, he was under the necessity of excluding him from the management of his lands. July 1.

708. Petition from the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm, requesting that the Settlement for Bengal year 1191 may be concluded with him. July 12.

709. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, containing several articles of complaint, which he requests may be referred to the Commissioners at Rangpur. July 22.

710. Petition from Gopí Mohan Rái, representing that the Zamíndár of Rájsháhi has dispossessed him of the Táluk of Matiáporá. July 26. Referred to Mr. Dallas.

711. Petition from the cultivators (rayats) of Surjyapur, respecting the oppression they are likely to suffer if the management of the District be given to the Zamíndár. July 29.

712. Petition from the Tálukdár of Jutmin, requesting that a remission be granted him of the amount reported by the investigating officer (Amín) to be a loss occasioned by wild hogs and buffaloes, and that the Settlement be concluded with him for the remainder of the assessment. July 29.

713. Letter from Resident at Bhográi, reporting that Chhatra Sinh has given himself up to Captain Hamilton and written a letter of submission to the Collector, who will put him in possession of Taraf Bhelá, allowed him for his maintenance; reporting the seizure of Bhág Rái, one of the principal ringleaders, as well as of the Zamíndár of Káliápál, who has had the greatest share in the late rebellion. July 8.

714. Letter from Resident at Bhográi, reporting that Chhatra Sinh has been taken in custody by the Fauzdárí Court, and requesting the Committee's orders whether he is to interfere, and to represent to the Court the conditions on which Chhatra Sinh surrendered himself. July 29.

715. Letter to Resident at Bhográi, in reply, stating the Committee's opinion that the public faith pledged to Chhatra Sinh ought to be inviolably preserved, and that the Honourable Board has been addressed on the subject. July 29.

716. Letter to Mr. William Bushley, enclosing letter from Mr. Shore relative to the institution of an Office for investigating and registering the Jágír and rent-free lands in Behar, and directing him to consider the rules laid down by that gentleman as his instructions for conducting the business of that office; and informing him that notice has been given of his appointment to the Collector of Behar, who will afford him assistance. July 1.

717. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, enclosing copy of an Amalnámá or lease to be executed by Zamíndárs and Farmers on concluding their Settlement for the present year. July 1.

718. Letter to Committee of Grain, enclosing copy of a letter from Silhet, and of another from Dacca, respecting inundations in those Districts. July 15.

719. Letter from Chief of Dacca, enclosing a price current of grain in his District. July 8.

720. Letter from Chief of Dacca, reporting the occurrence of a dreadful inundation in his District, which destroyed the crops and several villages, besides occasioning the loss of many lives; requesting orders whether he is to prevent the exportation of grain. July 15.

721. Letter to Chief of Dacca, informing him that the above letter has been referred to the Board; directing him to ascertain the damage done by the inundation, and report the situation of the people. July 15.

722. Letter from Governor-General and Council, expressing surprise at the Settlement being so far advanced, and at its having been concluded for five years; quoting orders from the Court of Directors expressly forbidding leases being granted for a term of years; and directing that the clause lately introduced in the leases (Amalnámás) for Sarkár Sáran, limiting the term to one year only, be inserted in all the present year's engagements in Bengal. July 1.

723. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of an Office being instituted for registering the alienated lands in Behar, agreeably to a plan laid down by Mr. Shore, and appointing Mr. Bushley to the office. July 1.

724. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of a letter and enclosures from the Collector of Midnapur, and submitting the expediency of treating Subah Sinh with lenity, and keeping him as a hostage for the good behaviour of his sons. July 5.

725. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of a letter received from the Collector of Silhet, reporting the occurrence of a dreadful inundation in his District, and enclosing an Account Settlement for the Bengal year 1191, which the Committee represents falls short 15,890 káhans of kauris of last year's assessment (Jámá) on account of some necessary deductions recommended by Mr. Lindsay, to whom directions have been sent to withdraw the prohibition he put on the exportation of grain in consequence of the above inundation. July 5.

726. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that the restraint laid on Rájá Debí Sinh's house be taken off; that the security offered by him be accepted, and that he himself be

directed to proceed to Rangpur under a proper guard; also stating that Mr. Paterson has been permitted to proceed to Rangpur to be present at the investigation. July 12.

727. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of a letter received from the Resident at Bhográi, and recommending, as Chhatra Sinh surrendered himself on promise of forgiveness for his past conduct, that he may be exempted from the jurisdiction of the Fauzdárí Court lately deputed into Bhográi. July 29.

728. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting that no possessions are held by the French in the Districts under his charge. July 8.

729. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, authorizing him to conclude the Settlement of Midnapur and Jaleswar Districts for 1192 on the same terms as last year, and approving of his propositions respecting sale of the lands of the Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs in balance on account of 1191. July 19.

730. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, enclosing an account statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) for the Bengal year 1190, and a representation from the Chaudhrís of Chunákháli; with a list of places which suffered most by the drought; and recommending that their claims for remission be attended to, as their balances cannot be recovered except by a sale of their lands. July 8.

731. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, reporting that from personal inquiries during his circuit, he finds that upon an average the produce of the crops has been deficient six annas in the rupee, or about three-eighths. July 8.

732. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Bardwán, directing his attendance or that of an authorized agent (Vakíl) for concluding the Settlement of his Zamíndárí. July 12.

733. Order (Parwáná) to Rájá Debí Sinh, stating that a guard will escort him to Rangpur. July 26.

734. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí, directing him to make all possible remittances from his treasury to the Resident at the Darbár (the Court of Murshidábád) for the purpose of relieving the distress of the Nawáb's family. July 1.

735. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, approving of the Settlement concluded by him for 1191. July 12.

736. Letters from Collector of Salt Districts, forwarding prices current of grain. July 5 and 15.

737. Letter from Collector of Silhet, reporting the occurrence of a dread-

ful inundation in his District, by which the crops have been destroyed, the town of Bagá and many villages washed away, together with the loss of many lives; and stating that, to remedy the fatal consequences of the disaster, he has for the present prohibited the exportation of grain from his District. July 5.

738. Letter to Collector of Silhet, in reply, stating that a copy of his letter has been sent to the Honourable Board, and directing him to take off the prohibition on the exportation of grain. July 5.

739. Letter to Collector of Silhet, approving of the Settlement of his District concluded by him. July 22.

740. Letter to Mr. Henry Vansittart, directing him to transmit an account of the debits and credits of the Rájá of Nadiyá. July 5.

## AUGUST, 1784.

741. Petition from the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm, respecting the impoverished state of his Zamíndárí. August 10.

742. Petition from Rání Bhabání, stating the opposition and interruptions she experiences from the Officers (Amlá) of the Díwání and the Faujdárí Adálat (Civil and Criminal Courts). August 23.

743. Letter to Resident at Bhográi, desiring him to acquaint the Criminal (Faujdárí) Officers with the Board's resolutions respecting Chhatra Sinh. August 16.

744. Letter to Mr. David Burges, enclosing copy of the Committee's Resolutions on the claims of the Sandwíp Zamíndárs. August 5.

745. Letter from Chief of Dacca, enclosing a price current of grain in his District. August 5.

746. Letter from Governor-General and Council, enclosing Amalnámás or Leases for the Settlement of Bengal for the present year. August 12.

747. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting copy of letter and enclosures from the Collector of Chittagong respecting the distressed state of the Province of Tipperah. August 23.

748. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of a letter from the Magistrate of Murshidábád, and his correspondence with the Magistrate of Bardwán, respecting ravages committed in the Bardwán District. August 30.

749. Letter to Governor-General in Council, in reply, enclosing copy of Board's Orders issued in consequence of the above disturbances. August 30.

750. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, stating proposals made by the Morbhanj Rájá for the future payment of his rents, and enclosing copy of a petition from the Rájá respecting several claims, etc., and requesting the orders of the Committee on the subject. August 2.

751. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, in reply, stating the Committee agree to the proposals made by the Morbhanj Rájá to pay a yearly rent of Rs. 3200 for his Zamíndárí, and desiring him to make provision for the payment of last year's balance. August 2.

752. Letter to Collector of Pánchet, enclosing him a copy of a letter from the Honourable Board on the neglect of Police Officers (Thanádárs) in respecting Company's territories and bleaching grounds. August 5.

753. Letter from Collector of Petty Mehals, enclosing account particulars of Settlement concluded with the Zamíndárs. August 19.

754. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, respecting the formation of a new Settlement with the Zamíndárs of the District, and respecting the distresses of the Rájá of Rámgarh. August 19.

755. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, enclosing statement of the debts and balances due by the Zamíndár of Jessor; and also a copy of a letter and enclosure to him from Mr. Henckell. August 19.

756. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, representing the necessity of advancing Takáví to the cultivators (rayats) of his District. August 23. Advance of Rs. 15,000 authorized.

## SEPTEMBER, 1784.

757. Letter to Resident at Bhográi, approving of the settlement made by him. September 9.

758. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, enclosing a list of Europeans, not Company's servants, residing in his District. September 23.

759. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing copy of a letter from the Resident at Tipperah respecting the distressed state of that District. September 2.

760. Letter from the Chief of Dacca, reporting that the fort (Kila) of Dacca has entirely gone to ruin. September 2.

761. Letter from Governor-General and Council, stating that in con-

sideration of the inundation in Tipperah, the duties upon grain in those parts have been ordered to be taken off. September 13.

762. Letter from Collector of Huglí, respecting unlicensed Europeans residing in his District. September 23.

763. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, enclosing an Account Settlement of his District for the Bengal year 1191. September 6.

764. Letter from Collector of Pánchet, with an Account Settlement (Kistbandís), etc. for the Bengal year 1191. September 16.

765. Letter to Chief of Patna, enclosing him a petition from the Agent (Vakíl) of Mír Bakhtullá, and desiring that Bakhtullá may be immediately released from prison. September 6.

766. Writ (Dastak) issued for the apprehension of any persons found collecting duties on grain at any of the Gháts (or landing places) formerly abolished by the Committee. September 2.

767. Order (Parwáná) to the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm, directing him not to interfere in the business of the iron mahals, etc. September 27.

768. Letter from Chief of Purniah, enclosing price current of grain. September 27.

769. Letter from Rangpur Commissioners, reporting the death of Mr. Broughton, one of the Commissioners. September 13.

770. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, on the subject of establishing Bahádur Sinh in his share of the Zamíndárí of Bírkúl. September 2.

771. Letter from Collector of Silhet, describing the distressed situation of the District. September 13.

## OCTOBER, 1784.

772. Petition from the Agent (Vakíl) of Dáúdpur, requesting a deduction of half the rents (Jamá) in consideration of losses sustained by the late inundation. October 4.

773. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, enclosing Account Settlement of his Districts for 1192, and also an account of Maharajá Kalián Sinh's balances. October 14.

774. Letter from Collector of Dacca, respecting scarcity of grain in that Province. October 14.

775. Letter to Governor-General and Council, enclosing copy of letter from the Chief of Dacca respecting the scarcity of grain in that Province, etc., and observing that as the duties on grain are collected by the Board of Customs, the Committee could not

carry into execution the orders of the Honourable Board of the 9th ult. October 14.

776. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of the Committee's proceedings respecting the Settlement of Sarkár Sáran. October 14.

777. Letter from Governor-General in Council, respecting duties taken off Marhattá pilgrims resorting to Gayá; approving of reasons assigned by Mr. Law for abolishing the Farmer's claim for administering justice; agreeing to the separation of the Gayá Revenue from the assessment (Jamá) of the Farmer, etc.; and appointing Mr. Charles Ogilvie a member of the Commission at Rangpur in the room of Mr. Broughton deceased. October 25.

778. Letter from Committee of Grain, enclosing copy of circular letter to the Chiefs and Collectors in the Revenue Department respecting the continued high price of paddy and rice. October 7.

779. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, with an account of collections and balances in his District for 1190 (Bengal era). October 4.

780. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, forwarding price current of grain in his District. October 25.

781. Letter to Peter Murray, Adjutant-General, respecting resolutions of the Honourable Board, and directing him to carry the orders for a reduction, contained therein, into execution. October 4.

782. Letter from Chief of Patna, enclosing account statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) for 1191 F. S. (Faslí era). October 25.

783. Order (Parwáná) to the Farmer of Tákári, informing him that his jurisdiction over the Ghátwáls is abolished, and that the Gayá revenues are separated from the revenues payable by him. October 25.

784. Letter from Chief of Purniah, enclosing a price current of grain in his District. October 11 and 25.

785. Letter to Chief of Purniah, enclosing him copy of a petition from Mati Lál the Farmer, and extract of Committee's proceedings respecting the disputes between him and the Zamíndár. October 28.

786. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí, stating that Sháh Madgerud has entered the District of Sálbárís with an armed force, and directing him to take proper steps to secure the Districts under his charge. October 18.

787. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí, directing him to apply the

whole of the revenue of Rájsháhí to the payment of the Murshidábád Court (Darbár) charges. October 14.

788. Letter from Collector of Sálbárís, reporting that Sháh Madgerud has made his appearance in his District with a force of armed men, and the steps taken by him in consequence. October 18.

789. Letter from Collector of Silhet, respecting the distress and depopulation of his District owing to the late inundation. October 7.

790. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, with an account statement (Jamá Wásí Bákí) of his District for 1191 (F. S.). October 18.

## NOVEMBER, 1784.

791. Petition from Jai Nárain Ghosál, requesting to be continued in possession of his Farm on the same terms as usual. November 8.

792. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, representing the bad success of his endeavours to recover the balances of last year, with enclosures respecting the duties taken off grain. November 22.

793. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, informing of depredations committed by Ján Bakhsh Khán, and of the measures taken by him in consequence. November 11. Approved.

794. Letter to Chief of Dacca, informing him that the Honourable Board has issued orders for taking off the duties on grain in Dacca. November 8.

795. Letter from Chief of Dacca, informing of measures taken by him with regard to the depredations of Madgerud Sháh. November 8.

796. Letter from Governor-General and Council, stating that orders have been issued to the Commissioner of Customs to take off the duties on grain in Tipperah, Silhet, and Dacca. November 8.

797. Letter from Governor-General in Council, forwarding copies ot letters and enclosures received from the Commissioners at Rangpur and from Mr. Paterson, with copy of the Board's orders in consequence. November 22.

798. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, enclosing prices current of grain in his District. November 8 and 22.

799. Order (Parwáná) to the Farmer of Purniah, informing him the Board is of opinion he should be made answerable for a robbery committed at Jagannáthpur. November 25.

800. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, enclosing Account Settlement of the District for the present year. November 18.

801. Letters from Chief of Purniah, enclosing prices current of grain in his District. November 8 and 22.

802. Letter from Chief of Purniah, respecting disputes between the Rájá of Dinájpur and the Zamíndár of Dilálpur, etc. November 25. Resolutions on the above subject.

803. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, respecting the family of the late Rájá of Rámgarh, and recommending that his eldest son be confirmed in the Zamíndárí. November 18.

804. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, enclosing prices current of grain in his District. November 8 and 29.

805. Letter to Collector of Sálbárís, stating that a brigade of Sepoys has been directed to proceed to Sálbárís for the protection of the District. November 11.

806. Letter to Collector of Silhet, informing him that the Honourable Board have issued orders to the Commissioner of Customs to take off the duties on grain in his District. November 11.

807. Letter from Collector of Silhet, with a further report on the distressed situation of his District. November 11.

808. Minute by Mr. John Shore, Acting President, respecting proposal made to him by Mr. Close for establishing a Silk Manufactory at Rángámáti. November 8.

809. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, with an Account Settlement and Kistbandí of the Districts under his charge. November 8.

810. Letter to Resident at Tipperah, informing him that the Honourable Board has given the necessary orders to take off the duties on grain in his District. November 8.

811. Letter to Captain Williams, directing him to furnish the Chief of Purniah with such Sepoys as he may require for the protection of his District. November 8.

## DECEMBER, 1784.

812. Petition from Muhammad Jamáli, with his report and decree respecting the Jágír of Muhammad Rezá Khán. December 9.

813. Petition from the legal Agent or Vakíl of Rájá of Bírbhúm, requesting that credit may be given to his constituent for Rs. 66,000 struck off from his monthly allowance (Musháhará). December 20. Rejected.

814. Letter to Commissioner at Bardwán, stating that the Committee is happy to find that the whole of the Revenues of his District have been completely realized. December 6. Similar letter to Collector of Chittagong, Rámgarh, and Salt Districts.

815. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, desiring them to be particularly strict in enforcing the collections. December 23.

816. Letter from Mr. John Dynely, enclosing an Account Settlement of the Provinces of Midnapur and Jaleswar for 1192. December 27.

817. Letter from Chief of Purniah, enclosing a price current of grain in his District. December 23.

818. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, forwarding two prices current of grain. December 9.

## JANUARY, 1785.

819. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, with enclosures respecting the depredations of Ján Bakhsh Khán, and the steps taken by him in consequence. January 20. Approved.

820. Letter from Major Crawford, with an Account Settlement and Kistbandí of Jhálidá for 1190 Bengal era. January 20.

821. Letter from Chief of Dacca, with a statement of the damage done by the late inundation in the Districts under his charge, with his remarks thereon. January 13.

822. Letter from Chief of Dacca, representing the distressed state of his District, and the solicitations made to him by the Zamíndárs and Farmers to be allowed a longer period for completing their payments and engagements for the present year. January 21. Answer thereto.

823. Letter from Chief of Dacca, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) of his District for 1188 and 1189. January 24.

824. Letter from Resident at Fathi Sinh, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) for 1191. January 20.

825. Letter to Governor-General and Council, respecting a plan of Settlement received from Mr. Henckell relative to the Sundarban lands. January 6.

826. Letter to Governor-General in Council, with the Committee's proceedings on the petition of Husain Rezá Khán against the Zamíndár of Idrakpur, in Dinájpur. January 10.

827. Letter from Governor-General in Council, respecting Mr. Pater-

son's correspondence with the Commissioners at Rangpur. January 13.

828. Letter to Governor-General in Council, regarding damages sustained in Dacca owing to the late inundation. January 13.

829. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing Settlement for the Bengal year 1190. January 24.

830. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing an extract of proceedings respecting the Madrasá or Muhammadan College in Calcutta. January 27.

831. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Bardwán, informing him that the sum of Rs. 430,000 will be wanted in a few days for the use of the troops under Colonel Pearse, and desiring him to reserve that amount from his remittances to the Presidency. January 6.

832. Order (Parwáná) to the Tálukdárs of Kásimpur and Jaipur Meghná, informing them that in default of paying their balances their Táluks will be sold. January 6.

833. Order (Parwáná) to Maulví Muhammad Majud-ud-dín, authorizing him to take charge of the collections of the Mahals for the support of the Madrasá. January 10.

834. Order (Parwáná) to all Zamíndárs and Renters through whose jurisdiction the new road passes, respecting the damage done thereto by the people (rayats). January 17.

835. Letter from Collector of Petty Mahals, reporting the disobedience of the Zamíndár of Wazírábád to his orders. January 3. Orders given.

836. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, enclosing Account Settlement and Kistbandí for 1190 B. S. January 10.

837. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, respecting the embankments of Lashkarpur, Bhitariá, and Bhúshná. January 17.

838. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí, enclosing an Order (Parwáná) to the Rání requiring payment of the balance of Agraháyan (October), and the Kist, or instalment, for Paush (November). January 6.

839. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, stating his opinion that it is impossible for the Rání to comply with the requisition of the Committee. January 27.

840. Letter from Captain Rankine, respecting the damage done to the new road by the people (rayats). January 17.

841. Letter from Captain Rankine, requesting that Parwánás may be sent to the Zamíndárs of Pánchet, Bishnupur, Bardwán, and

Huglí to supply him with coolies, and also requesting an order may be granted him on the renter of Bardwán for Rs. 10,000. January 20. Granted.

842. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, enclosing copy of a letter and enclosures from the Honourable Board respecting the claims of the Deb Rájá, with orders thereon. January 27.

843. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, enclosing General Treasury Account, Settlement Account, and Kistbandís for his District for 1190. January 10.

844. Letter from Commissioner at Sandwíp, respecting obstructions and difficulties met by him in executing the measurement and division of Sandwíp. January 24.

845. Letter from Mr. J. Shore, Acting President, with his remarks on the Kists (period and amount of instalments) and balances of the different Districts, etc. January 6.

846. Letter from Mr. John Shore, laying before the Committee a petition from the Rání of Tipperah and the nephew of the deceased Rájá. January 21. Orders on the subject.

847. Letter from Mr. J. Shore, laying before the Committee a petition from the Farmer of Panchánnagáon praying for a renewal of his lease for three years. January 24.

848. Letter to Resident at Tipperah, informing him of the Rání having presented a petition praying that Rájá Dhámánik may be declared the successor of the late Rájá, with the Committee's instructions in consequence. January 21.

## FEBRUARY, 1785.

849. Petition from Jainaráyan Ghoshál, respecting the sequestration of his Farm, and informing that he will pay his balance if credited with the amount collected by Mr. Burgess. February 7.

850. Petition from the Rájá of Bardwán, with enclosures, respecting the claim of Nawáb Ashraf Khán. February 14.

851. Petition from Rájá Mitrajit Sinh, praying that a deduction may be allowed him on account of the exemption of the pilgrims from paying duties. February 28.

852. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, enclosing Taují or Assessment, and Treasury Accounts of the Districts under his charge, together with an account of Mahárájá Kalián Sinh's balance. February 28.

853. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, informing him the Committee

rely upon his exertions for the complete realization of his collections by the end of the year. February 7.

854. Letter to Commissioner at Bardwán, informing him that the Board has decided upon abolishing his office from the end of the month. February 10.

855. Letter from Collector of Calcutta, enclosing a report of the Amín deputed in June 1784 to ascertain the right to certain disputed lands in the Salt Water Lakes. February 14.

856. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, containing instructions respecting reductions of the Sibandí corps to take place on the 1st March. February 4.

857. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, directing them to transmit an account of the number of Company's servants necessary for carrying on the business of their departments. February 7.

858. Circular Letter to those whose offices are to be abolished at the close of the year, informing them that it is the pleasure of the Honourable Board to continue them in their different stations till the close of the year. February 21.

859. Letter to Major Crawford, Collector at Jhálidá, stating that the Committee rely on his exertions for the complete and punctual realization of the collections by the end of the year. February 7.

860. Letter from Chief of Dacca, enclosing Account Settlement and Kistbandí for the Bengal year 1190. February 3.

861. Letter to the Díwán, directing him to prepare a writ (Dastak) against Jai Náráyan Ghoshál, and an order (Parwáná) to Rájá Rájballabh. February 7.

862. Letter from the Díwán, reporting on the Nazráná, or investiture fee, due to Government by Loknáth Nandi. February 10.

863. Letter from Resident at Fathi Sinh, respecting orders received from the Honourable Board regarding the abolition of his office. February 28.

864. Letter to Governor-General and Council, respecting information received from the Chief of Purniah of disturbances in Morang, etc., and recommending that two companies of Sepoys be ordered to protect the frontiers of Purniah. February 3.

865. Letter from Governor-General in Council, informing the Committee of the appointment of Messrs. W. Cooper and T. Graham as members of the Committee, in the room of Messrs. D. Anderson and John Shore resigned. February 4.

866. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing copies of

several resolutions passed by the Board respecting retrenchments to take effect from the 1st March 1785. February 4.

867. Letter to Governor-General, etc., in reply to the above, with the Committee's opinion on the subject. February 4.

868. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that orders have been sent to the Commander-in-Chief to send two companies of Sepoys to Purniah, in consequence of disturbances between the Hill Rájás. February 10.

869. Letter from Governor-General in Council, desiring to be furnished with a statement of the revenues of the country as they stood on the 1st inst. February 14.

870. Letter to Governor-General in Council, in reply, forwarding the required statement. February 14.

871. Letter to Governor-General in Council, agreeing to the form of Amalnámá, or lease, proposed by Mr. Henckell to be given by him to the Renters. February 21.

872. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing copy of a letter from the Collector of Rangpur respecting steps taken by him in consequence of the claims of the Deb Rájá. February 28.

873. Letter from Collector of Huglí, reporting on the measures taken by him in consequence of the damage done to the new road passing through his District. February 14.

874. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, enclosing account of the assessment (Jamá) of District Murshidábád for the Bengal years 1188, 1189, and 1190. February 14.

875. Writ (Dastak) issued to Jai Náráyan Ghoshál, for the payment of the balance due by him. February 7.

876. Order (Parwáná) to Rájá Rájballabh, requiring immediate payment of his balance. February 7.

877. Order (Parwáná) to the Farmer of Dip Chánd, directing him to apprehend Rámgobind Baniá, the Tálukdár of Babupur, and send him to the Court (Huzúr), in consequence of a complaint against him for establishing an illicit Salt Manufactory. February 28.

878. Letter from Chief of Purniah, with enclosures, respecting disturbances in Morang (Sikim). February 3.

879. Letter to Chief of Purniah, informing him that two companies of Sepoys have been sent for the protection of his District. February 14.

880. Letter from Chief of Purniah, respecting the steps taken by him

in consequence of the disputes between the Hill Rájás, etc. February 28.

881. Letter from Chief of Purniah, enclosing a price current of grain in his District. February 28.

882. Letter to Mr. Francis Redfearn, Collector of Nadiyá, enclosing a petition from Báránasi Ghosh and Darpanárayan Thákur, as also an account current of their demands on the Rájá of Nadiyá, with instructions in consequence. February 28.

883. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, informing of measures adopted by him respecting the claims of the Deb Rájá. February 28.

## MARCH, 1785.

884. Petition from the Landholders (Chaudhrís) of Alapsinh, complaining against the Zamíndár of Srípur. March 14.

885. Petition from the Cultivators (rayats) of Jahángírpur, with an abstract of their complaints against the Farmer. March 24.

886. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, requesting that the peons put upon his brother may be withdrawn. March 28.

887. Letter to Resident at Bhográi, enclosing the Committee's resolutions respecting Jadu Sinh and his son Chhatra Sinh, with directions to furnish the information required. March 3.

888. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, enclosing copy of a letter from the Secretary to the Governor-General in Council regarding salaries and establishments of the Company's Civil Servants upon the Bengal establishment. March 3.

889. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, desiring them to issue orders to all Zamíndárs, Tálukdárs, Farmers, and others, in charge of collections of revenue, prohibiting them from collecting Hálbhanjan, or revenue in anticipation. March 7.

890. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, enclosing copy of a letter from the Secretary to the Secret Department prohibiting the acceptance of presents (Nazars) from the natives, in consequence of the regulations of the late Act of Parliament. March 28.

891. Letter from Mr. W. Cowper, Acting President, laying before the Committee a petition from Kutab Alí Khán representing oppressions felt by him through the displeasure of Mr. Thomas Law. March 3.

892. Minute by Mr. W. Cowper, respecting the new Settlement for the ensuing year 1192. March 10.

893. Minute by Mr. W. Cowper, enclosing his correspondence with Mr. Graham, respecting the mutilation of records which that gentleman states is being carried on at the Khálsá. March 16.

894. Minute by Mr. W. Cowper, respecting Takávi advance required by the Renters of Purniah. March 28.

895. Letter from Chief of Dacca, respecting a practice established by the lower order of Portuguese, and the measures adopted by him in consequence. March 14. Approved.

896. Minute by Mr. John Evelyn, regarding the claims of the Farmer of Purniah on the Zamíndárs. March 10.

897. Letter to the Díwán, directing him to prepare and lay before the Committee a plan of Settlement for the year 1192. March 10.

898. Letter from the Díwán, forwarding statement of monthly allowance (Musháhará) due to the Zamíndár of Fathi Sinh for the years 1190 and 1191. March 3.

899. Letter to the Díwán, directing him to prepare an account of the balances of revenue due from Bardwán, specifying the sum collected year by year, on account of the engagements entered into by the Rájá for discharging them; as well as a similar account of the balances due in the Dewrí Mahals. March 16.

900. Letter from Messrs. Graham and Croftes, enclosing statement of retrenchments in the establishment of the Revenue Department. March 21.

901. Letter to Governor-General and Council, on the subject of re-establishing a Mint at Murshidábád. March 10.

902. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of a letter from the Collector of Sálbárís, informing of an action between Lieutenant Crow and Sháh Mudgenud. March 21.

903. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of a resolution appointing the Preparer of Reports to receive and consider on all Petitions referred to him by Natives. March 31.

904. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing resolutions passed by them respecting retrenchments, etc. March 31.

905. Letter to Governor-General in Council, with the Committee's remarks respecting the new Settlement to be made for the ensuing year. March 31.

906. Letter from Mr. T. Graham, enclosing his minute, explaining his suspicion of a mutilation of records being carried on in the Khálsá. March 16.

907. Letter to Major Hardy, directing him to carry the orders of the

Honourable Board into execution respecting the abolition of the Sibandí Corps. March 14.

908. Letter from Resident at Jaleswar, requesting that an additional company of Sepoys may be sent for the protection of his District, in consequence of the abolition of the Sibandí Corps. March 14.

909. Order (Parwáná) to the Zamíndárs, Tálukdárs, and Farmers of Sálbárís, desiring that they will pay their balances. March 28.

910. Letter to Preparer of Reports, directing him to search the records of the late Council at Bardwán for the petition presented to it in 1186 by Jadu Sinh, and the Parwáná granted in consequence for the Zamíndárí of Bhográi in the name of Chhatra Sinh, and to lay it before the Committee, and also the proceedings of the Provincial Council and of the Governor-General in Council, if any were held upon the said petition. March 3.

911. Letter from Preparer of Reports, with enclosures, respecting the state of the Khálsá Records. March 16. Orders in consequence.

912. Letter to Collector of Rohtás, with enclosures, and a copy of the Honourable Board's resolutions respecting the remissions claimed by Rájá Mitrajit Sinh. March 14.

913. Letter from Collector of Rhotás, reporting that he has issued orders prohibiting the illicit exaction of duties in his District. March 24.

914. Letter from Collector of Sálbárís, respecting Lieutenant Crow's action with Sháh Mudgerud, and the measures adopted by him in consequence. March 21.

915. Letter to Collector of Sálbárís, approving of the vigilance and activity of Lieutenant Crow in checking the operations of Sháh Mudgerud. March 21.

916. Letter from Collector of Sálbárís, stating that the Zamíndárs of his District have desired him to represent to the Committee their inability to pay the fees (Rusúm). March 28.

## APRIL, 1785.

917. Petition from Behárí Sinh, complaining of depredations by the Zamíndár of Pánchet. April 11.

918. Letter to Superintendent of Miscellaneous Lands (Bází Zamín) in Behar, enclosing copy of a letter and two enclosures from the

Honourable Board, respecting Bází Zamín; and also the original plan for conducting the office. April 18.

919. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) of Rájmahal for 1191, together with Jamá Wásil Bákí of Bhágalpur for seven months of the Behar year 1192. April 25.

920. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) of his District for the Bengal year 1191. April 28.

921. Letter from Chief of Dacca, forwarding the account required by the Committee regarding the balances outstanding in his District, occasioned by the late inundation. April 4.

922. Letter from Chief of Dacca, with a price current of grain in his District. April 7.

923. Letter to Governor-General and Council, enclosing the Committee's proceedings relative to the Rájá of Tipperah. April 11.

924. Letter to Governor-General, etc., enclosing a plan of settlement proposed by the Collector of Silhet. April 18.

925. Letter from Governor-General in Council, respecting Rájá Dharmanik's succession to the Ráj of Tipperah. April 25.

926. Letter from Mr. T. Henckell, respecting plan of settlement, etc., and enclosing a letter to the Board on the subject. April 14.

927. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting on depredations committed by Dámodar Bhanj, and enclosing copies of his letters to Lieutenant-Colonel Fullarton and Lieutenant Dickens on the subject. April 4.

928. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, respecting the lawless proceedings of the Pánchet Zamíndárs, and requesting that measures may be adopted in consequence. April 18.

929. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting on a petition from the Zamíndár of Náráyangarh, respecting two Abwábs (illegal cesses) said to have been imposed upon the rayats of Kandar. April 25.

930. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, directing him to attach the lands of Dámodar Bhanj. April 28.

931. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, enclosing a comparative statement of the sums advanced by Government for the Rájá of Nadiyá, with remarks, etc. April 4.

932. Order (Parwáná) to the Zamíndárs and Farmers of the Huzúrí Mahals, directing their attendance on the Committee for the purpose of making a new Settlement. April 11.

933. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Bardwán, directing him to issue orders prohibiting rayats from injuring the new road. April 11.

934. Order (Parwáná) to the Zamíndár of Narayangarh, informing him that he has no right to collect the Abwábs (or irregular cesses) complained of by the rayats of Kandar. April 25.

935. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, respecting the orders of the Honourable Board regarding presents (*nazars*). April 7.

936. Letter from Preparer of Reports, reporting on a petition from the Zamíndár of Nadiyá. April 7.

937. Letter from Commissioners at Rangpur, stating that they have received orders from the Honourable Board to close their inquiry. April 18.

938. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, with enclosures, stating that Mr. Marriott declines the Grant of the Knot Sál Jungle. April 7.

939. Letter from Commissioner of Sandwíp, in reply to a petition presented by the Tálúkdars of Sandwíp, and also enclosing copy of his proceedings from the 1st January to the end of February. April 28.

940. Letter from Collector of Silhet, enclosing Account Settlement of his District, also an Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) and General Treasury Account for 1190 B. S. April 14.

941. Letter from Collector of Silhet, respecting the balances outstanding in his District, and the distressed state of the inhabitants; also a plan of Settlement which he submits to the Committee for consideration. April 14.

942. Letter from Resident at Tipperah, respecting the succession to the Ráj of that District. April 11.

## MAY, 1785.

943. Petition from Kási Náth Bábu, requesting to be repaid the sum of Rs. 58,480 due to him on account of interest. May 2. Payment ordered.

944. Petition from the Zamíndár of Idrakpur in Dinájpur, delivering in proposals to rent that Parganá. May 25. Accepted.

945. Petition from the Zamíndár of Birbhúm, with proposals to rent his Zamíndárí, and praying that the Amín deputed into his District may be recalled. May 26. Agreed to.

946. Petition from Jainaráyan Ghoshál, with his proposals for farming Sandwíp, etc. May 31. Rejected.

947. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing a price current of grain in his District. May 16.

948. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, desiring them to furnish, as soon as possible, particulars of lands sold in their Districts since February 1781, and remissions made, etc. May 9.

949. Circular Letter, enclosing copy of the Honourable Board's letter on the Settlement, etc., with copy of the 39th Article of the late Act of Parliament, etc. May 12.

950. Letter to Chief of Dacca, with instructions respecting the Settlement for the forthcoming year. May 12.

951. Letter to Chief of Dacca, enclosing petition from the Zamíndárs of Hazrádí complaining of the amount at which their Zamíndárí is assessed, for his report. May 26.

952. Letter from the Díwán, delivering in his answer to the Dinájpur petition. May 2.

953. Letter from Resident at Fathi Sinh, enclosing General Treasury Account, and Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) for 1191. May 25.

954. Letter from Governor-General in Council, desiring to be furnished with a Statement of the nett annual receipts of revenue from the whole of the Provinces from the cession of the Díwání to the present time. May 2.

955. Letter from Governor-General in Council, confirming Rájá Dharmánik to the Ráj of Tipperah. May 9.

956. Letter from Governor-General in Council, authorizing the Committee to proceed with the Settlement for the present year. May 12.

957. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of Mr. Law's proceedings, and also agreeing to allow him one moiety of the annual increase on the miscellaneous (Sáyer) Revenue. May 16.

958. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing the Committee to make the Settlement of the Huzúri Districts. May 25.

959. Letter to Governor-General in Council, respecting a boat load of slaves stopped by the police. May 26.

960. Letter from Collector of Pánchet, enclosing Takáví Account, and a statement of the Revenue for 1191. May 30.

961. Letter from Chief of Patna, enclosing Kistbandí Account for the Behar year 1192. May 5.

962. Letter from Chief of Patna, enclosing a petition from Rájá Bikramárjit Sinh, claiming Málikáná. May 16. Replied to.

963. Writ (Dasták) to bring Rájá Chaitan Sinh, Zamíndár of Bishnupur, to the Presidency. May 5.

964. Orders (Parwánás) to the Rájás of Bardwán, Bishnupur, Táherpur, and Rájsháhí, demanding payment of their balances. May 19.

965. Letter from Collector of the Petty Mahals, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) for the Bengal year 1191. May 25.

966. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) and General Treasury Account for 1191. May 30.

967. Letter to Collector of Rohtás, enclosing copy of a letter from the Honourable Board, allowing him a moiety on the annual increase of the miscellaneous (Sáyer) Revenue. May 16.

968. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí), and General Treasury Account for the Bengal year 1191. May 25.

## JUNE, 1785.

969. Petitions from the Farmers of Krishnagar, with their representations in consequence of the settlement ordered to be made with the Zamíndár of Nadiyá. May 9.

970. Petition from Rájá Dámodar Sinh, with his proposals for the farm of Bishnupur. June 11. Accepted.

971. Petition from Krishna Sinh Rái, representing injuries suffered by him through the Chief of Jessor. June 20.

972. Petition from Rájá Debí Sinh, praying that the guard stationed over him might be taken off. June 30.

973. Letter from Superintendent of Miscellaneous lands (Bází Zamín), respecting lands belonging to the late Jai Krishna Bábu, which the Kásijorá Rájá has taken possession of without the knowledge of Government. June 23.

974. Letter from Resident at Bhográi, enclosing a genealogical account of the family of Jadu Sinh, with his remarks. June 3.

975. Letter from Collector of Calcutta, requesting to be furnished with such extracts of the Committee's proceedings as relate to the Settlement of Panchánnagáon and Páldángá for 1192. June 2.

976. Letter from Collector of Calcutta, respecting the new Settlement. June 6.

977. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, informing him that Sandwíp

is put under his charge, and desiring him to make the Settlement accordingly. June 9.

978. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, respecting the progress of the new Settlement. June 14.

979. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, forwarding a price current of grain in his District. June 20.

980. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, enclosing a Proclamation of Peace, etc. June 30.

981. Letter from Mr. W. Cowper, Acting President, reporting on the representation (Wájíb-Ulárz) of the Rájá of Bardwán. June 11.

982. Letter to Mr. Samuel Charters, President, requesting him to write to Muzaffar Jang, and transmit him a paragraph in a petition received from the landholders (Chaudhrís) of Chunákhálí, for his answer to the complaints against him. June 20.

983. Letter to Chief of Dacca, informing him that Jaleswar is annexed to his District, and desiring him to conclude the Settlement with the Tálukdárs. June 9.

984. Letter from Chief of Dacca, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) of his District for 1191. June 20.

985. Letter to the Díwán, directing him to call upon such of the Bhuluá Tálukdárs to renew their engagement, whose terms of lease have expired. June 2.

986. Letter from the Díwán, delivering in a list of such Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs as have signed engagements for the present year. June 3.

987. Letter from the Díwán, laying before the Committee Deeds of Settlement prepared by him for the Rájá of Nadiyá. June 25.

988. Letter to Governor-General in Council, forwarding extracts of the Committee's proceedings respecting the new Settlement. June 3.

989. Letter to Governor-General in Council, respecting the conduct of the Rájá of Chhotá Nágpur. June 7.

990. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the Committee's proceedings on the Settlement. June 9.

991. Letter from Governor-General in Council, conveying further instructions respecting the Settlement, and enclosing a petition from the Zamíndár of Nadiyá. June 9.

992. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing extract from the Committee's proceedings relative to the Settlement of the Huzúrí Mahals, or Mahals paying Revenue direct to the Collector, for the current year. June 11.

993. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of a letter from the Resident at Tipperah respecting the reduced state of his District, and stating that a deduction has been made in the assessment (Jamá) on account of the distressed situation of the country. June 14.

994. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of letter from the Collector of Sarkár Sáran, proposing a plan for the cultivation of several tracts of waste lands in his District. June 23.

995. Letter from Governor-General in Council, respecting the re-establishment of the Rájá of Nadiyá in the management of his Zamíndárí. June 25.

996. Letter to Governor-General in Council, accompanying extracts from the Committee's proceedings on the Settlement, etc. June 25.

997. Letter to Governor-General in Council, on the subject of the Nadiyá Settlement and the claims of the Rájá. June 27.

998. Letter from the Collector of Huglí, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) Account for 1191. June 23.

999. Letter from Resident at Jaleswar, on the subject of his inquiries and adjustment of disputes in that District. June 23.

1000. Letter from Collector of Midnapore, reporting having attached the lands of Dámodar Bhanj. June 14.

1001. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, informing of steps taken by him in consequence of the District of Sálbárís having been annexed to Murshidábád, and requesting that orders (Parwánás) may be issued to the Farmers of Sálbárís and Jahángírpur in consequence. June 7.

1002. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, with Jamá Wásil Bákí Account for 1191 B. S. June 14.

1003. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, informing him of the Settlement having been made with the Rájá, and enclosing him copy of the Deeds of Settlement. June 20.

1004. Writ (Dastak) issued for the apprehension of the Zamíndár of Bishnupur. June 6.

1005. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Chhotá Nágpur, reprimanding him for his obstinacy, and desiring that he will personally attend at the Kachárí, or Court, of the Collector of Rámgarh, and settle his balances. June 7.

1006. Order (Parwáná) to the Zamíndárs of Jahángirpur, ordering them to attend the Chief of Murshidábád, to make the Settlement. June 9.

1007. Letter from Collector of twenty-four Parganás, enclosing General Treasury Account and Jamá Wásil Bákí Account for 1191 B. S. June 23.

1008. Letter from Chief of Purniah, reporting on steps taken by him relative to the Settlement. June 23.

1009. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, representing the refractory conduct of the Rájá of Chhotá Nágpur. June 7.

1010. Letter from Collector of the Salt Districts, respecting Settlement of the current year, and requesting permission to resign the charge of the collections of Jessor. June 16.

1011. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, respecting several tracts of waste lands in his District, and proposing a plan for bringing them into cultivation. June 23.

1012. Letter from Resident at Tipperah, respecting the distressed state of his District, and the impossibility of realizing the revenues; requesting to be authorized to make a deduction of Rs. 28,000 in the present year's assessment (Jamá). June 14.

1013. Letter to Resident at Tipperah, authorizing him to make the Settlement and the deductions as recommended by him. June 14.

## JULY, 1785.

1014. Petition from Ahmad Alí Khán, representing obstructions thrown in his way by a report which prevails of the restoration of the Zamíndárs, etc., and requesting that a new Sanad may be granted to him. July 5.

1015. Petition from the Gomáshtá or clerk in charge of the collections of Bardákhát in Tipperah, praying that an Order (Parwána) may be issued to cause the return of the deserted rayats. July 5.

1016. Petition from the Zamíndár of Nadiyá, objecting to pay his revenue through Mr. Redfearn. July 11. Rejected.

1017. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, reporting the progress made by him in forming the Settlement. July 14.

1018. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, respecting the representations of the Zamíndárs of Jugdiá, that their lands are washed away by the sea, etc., and respecting a sand-bank (Char) formed by the sea, which the Zamíndárs of Chittagong have taken possession of. July 5.

1019. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, enclosing extracts from the proceedings of the Honourable Board in the secret depart-

ment of inspection, relative to new regulations to take effect from the 1st July and 1st August. July 7.

1020. Letter from Mr. S. Charters, President, laying before the Committee a statement of balances of the Huzúrí Mahals for 1191, together with his report upon them. July 18.

1021. Letter from Mr. S. Charters, informing the Committee that the Rájá of Bardwán has paid up his balance for 1191. July 28.

1022. Letter to Chief of Dacca, directing him to issue orders to the Zamíndárs under his authority, prohibiting them from detaining the cultivators (rayats) deserted from Bardákhat. July 5.

1023. Letter from Chief of Dacca, enclosing statement of progress made by him regarding the Settlement for the current year. July 14.

1024. Letter to Mr. John Evelyn, requesting him to make inquiries into the state of the Seminary for Muhammadan learning. July 5.

1025. Letter to Governor-General in Council, forwarding proceedings of the Committee, showing progress made in the Settlement for the current year. July 14.

1026. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the Committee's proceedings on the Settlement, and forwarding orders respecting the claims of the Zamíndár of Nadiyá. July 18.

1027. Letter to Governor-General in Council, respecting new coin proposed by the Mint Master. July 21.

1028. Letter to Governor-General in Council, accompanying a comparative Account Settlement for 1191 and 1192 B. S. July 28.

1029. Letter from Collector of Huglí, reporting progress made in forming the Settlement. July 14.

1030. Letter from Resident at Jaleswar, enclosing a petition from the Zamíndár and Tálukdárs of Jaleswar, praying to be permitted to collect Hálbhanjan, or revenues before they become due; also translation of questions put to the Zamíndárs on the subject of Hálbhanjan, with their replies. July 11.

1031. Letter to Resident at Jaleswar, permitting the collection of Hálbhanjan, with orders on the subject. July 11.

1032. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, reporting the progress made by him in forming the Settlement. July 14.

1033. Order (Parwáná) to the Superior of the Muhammadan Seminary, directing him to give every assistance to Mr. Evelyn to enable him to make inquiries into the present state of that institution. July 5.

1034. Order (Parwáná) to the Rájá of Bardwán, informing him that his monthly allowance (Musháhará) will be augmented provided he will pay his balances. July 18.

1035. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, reporting the progress made by him in forming the Settlement. July 14.

1036. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, enclosing Jamá Wásil Bákí Account of Khálárí or Salt land rents from 1187 to 1190 B. S. July 7.

1037. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, enclosing Account Settlement of his Districts for the current year. July 21.

1038. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, enclosing copy of the Settlement for the current year 1192. July 14.

## AUGUST, 1785.

1039. Letter from Chief of Dacca, enclosing a price current of grain in his District. August 16.

1040. Letter from Mr. John Evelyn, with enclosures reporting on the state of the Muhammadan Madrasá (College). August 2.

1041. Letter to Governor-General and Council, enclosing copy of a letter and enclosures from Mr. Evelyn reporting on the state of the Muhammadan Madrasá, with the Committee's resolutions. August 2.

1042. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing reports, etc., respecting the claims of Mr. Christie on the Zamíndár of Dinájpur. August 22.

1043. Letter from Mr. Hannay Ramsay, requesting permission, on the part of Mr. Lovett, to relinquish his title to the village of Howrah on the 1st October 1786, and to pay the rent in future to the Zamíndár. August 22. Agreed to.

1044. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, reporting that he has stopped payment of all demands upon his treasury until the arrears due to the troops at Barhampur are paid up. August 8.

1045. Order (Parwáná) to Muhammad Majad-ud-dín, informing him of the Committee's opinion respecting an increase of allowance to the Students in the Madrasá, and desiring that he will use his authority agreeably to the fixed regulations of the Governor-General. August 2.

1046. Letter from Chief of Purniah, enclosing an account current of the price of grain in his District. August 25.

1047. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, respecting the sum of Rs. 22,107 said to have been paid by the Rájá of Dinájpur. August 2.

1048. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, representing the state of his District from the late heavy rains, and recommending that indulgences be granted the renters, in the shape of a suspension in the demands of revenue. August 22.

1049. Letter to Collector of Tirhut, in reply, authorizing him to grant a temporary suspension. August 22.

## SEPTEMBER, 1785.

1050. Petition from Zamíndár of Parganá Dilwárpur, complaining of the injustice of the Zamíndár of Dinájpur. September 1.

1051. Petition from Rádhá Krishná Mitra, complaining of exactions made by the Zamíndár and Farmer of Parganá Bishnupur in Bardwán, and requesting an order (Parwáná). September 1. Ordered.

1052. Petition from Rámnáráyan Sazáwal, complaining of the illegal proceedings of the Zamíndár of Chandradwíp. September 15.

1053. Letter to Mr. R. Bathurst, with his instructions for making the Settlement for the Faslí year 1193. September 15.

1054. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) of his District for 1190 B. S. September 19.

1055. Letter to the Díwán, ordering him to conclude the Settlement of the Huzúrí District of Midnapur for 1193 W. S. upon the terms of last year. September 29.

1056. Letter from Governor-General and Council, informing that the proceedings of the Committee relative to the inundation in the Dacca Province are approved; approving of the plan of Settlement proposed by the Collector of Silhet, and directing that it be carried into execution. September 1.

1057. Letter to Governor-General in Council, requesting commands in making the Settlement of the Behar and Orissa Mahals for the ensuing Faslí year 1193. September 8.

1058. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the proposed Settlement for Behar and Orissa. September 15.

1059. Letter to Resident at Jaleswar, authorizing him to make the Settlement of Jaleswar for 1193 W. S. September 15.

1060. Letter to Mr. Henry Lodge, enclosing a petition from the Zamíndár of Rájnagar in Dacca, and directing him not to interfere in the Mufassal Collections. September 29.

1061. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, enclosing him copy of a letter from Rájá Moodage (?); and directing him to use every endeavour to prevent any disputes between the Tálukdárs and the Marhattás. September 15.

1062. Letter to Chief of Patna, with instructions for making the Settlement for the Faslí year 1193. September 15.

1063. Order (Parwaná) to the Zamíndár and Farmer of Bishnupur, directing them to make immediate restitution to Rádhá Krishna Mitra. September 1.

1064. Letter from Chief of Purniah, complaining of the disregard paid to the Committee's orders by the Zamíndár of Dinájpur. September 1.

1065. Letter to Chief of Purniah, directing him to protect the Zamíndár of Dilalpur in his rights and property. September 1.

1066. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, with a list of puls, or embankments, which have given way in his District. September 22.

1067. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, with general Treasury Account and Jamá Wásil Bákí Account for 1192 F. S. September 19.

1068. Letter from Preparer of Reports, with an account of lands sold on the 2d inst. pursuant to the Committee's orders. September 5.

1069. Letter from Collector of Rohtás, requesting a deduction of Customs duties on exports from his Districts. September 1.

1070. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, directing him to inform the Committee of his further proceedings respecting the Deb Rájá. September 15.

1071. Letter to Collector of Salt Districts, with instructions for making the Settlement for the ensuing year. September 15.

1072. Letter to Collector of Tirhut, with instructions for making the Settlement for the ensuing Faslí year. September 15.

## OCTOBER, 1785.

1073. Petition from the Widow of Ghulam Ghosh Khán, complaining of Mr. Bushby having sequestered her Jágír. October 3.

1074. Petition from Balrám Háwáldár, complaining of being dispossessed of Táluks mortgaged to him. October 23.

1075. Petitions (3) from Ahmad Alí Khán, for farming Sháhábád, and requesting the sole management may be vested in him. October 6.

1076. Petition from the Zamíndár of the two annas, or one-eighth division, of Sárang, setting forth the dissensions of the different partners, and requesting that a Sazáwal be appointed to make the Collections and protect the Zamíndárs. October 31.

1077. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, forwarding Account Settlement of his District for 1193 F. S. October 24.

1078. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, transmitting Account Settlement of his District for 1193 Faslí. October 17. Approved.

1079. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, reporting the backwardness of the Zamíndárs in contributing to a fund for erecting public granaries. October 31.

1080. Letter to Government Customs Collector of Calcutta, enclosing the Honourable Board's Regulations for Collecting Duties from Foreign Nations. October 14.

1081. Letter to the Díwán, informing him that the Jainagar Mahal is struck out of the Account Settlement of the Huzúrí Mahals. October 7.

1082. Letter to Governor-General and Council, stating the origin and nature of monthly allowances (Musháhará). October 14.

1083. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing Statement of the proposed reductions in the Revenue Department. October 20.

1084. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that in every case the legal heir be appointed to succeed to all landed property, and in case of nonage the care of securing the revenues be given to a person appointed by the Committee; allowing Mr. Henckell Rs. 10 for every Tiger killed; and approving of the directions given to the Collector of Midnapur for the recovery of Revenue. October 20.

1085. Letter from Governor-General in Council, forwarding a petition from the creditors of the Rájá of Nadiyá, and directing that one-third of his monthly allowance (Musháhará) be appropriated for the liquidation of the claims. October 28.

1086. Letter from Chief of Patna, enclosing Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) of his District for 1192 F. S. October 28.

1087. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, transmitting his Account Settlement and Statement of Instalments (Kistbandís) for 1192 B. S.

1088. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, enclosing the Settlement and Instalment (Kistbandí) Account of Pánchet and Jhálidá for 1190. October 14.

1089. Letter to Preparer of Reports, directing him to lay before the Committee, the former and present Governor-General and Council's proceedings relative to the Courts of Civil Judicature. (Adálats). October 14.

1090. Letter from Preparer of Reports, reporting on the rise and progress of the Courts of Civil Judicature. October 20.

1091. Letter from Collector of Rohtás, enclosing his proceedings on a complaint of Rájá Mitrajit Sinh against Rám Sewak. October 17.

1092. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, stating the unequal proportions made in the Settlement by Mr. Moore. October 3.

1093. Letter to the Collector of Rangpur, pointing out the remissions granted by the Committee. October 3.

1094. Letter to Collector of Sarkár Sáran, directing him to make the Settlement for the ensuing year. October 6.

## NOVEMBER, 1785.

1095. Petition from the Zamíndár of Bishnupur, complaining against the Farmer Dámodar Sinh. November 3.

1096. Petition from Babar Alí Khán, requesting to be released from confinement. November 3.

1097. Petition from Security (Málzámín) of the twelve Anna or three-fourths division of Parganá Bhulua, complaining of the outrages of the Sazáwal deputed into that Parganá, and requesting redress. November 7.

1098. Petition from the Rayats of Bírbhúm, complaining of the exactions of the Farmer, and requesting redress. November 17.

1099. Petition from the Zamíndár of Rájnagar, requesting that Mr. Lodge may be recalled, and himself allowed to pay the revenues. November 24.

1100. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, respecting the Office of Superintendant of Rent Free lands in Behar. November 7.

1101. Letter from Superintendant of Bází Zamín, or rent free lands, in Behar, with sundry enclosures respecting the nature of the Jágírs or Military tenures. November 7.

1102. Letter to Governor-General and Council, stating the refusal of

Zamíndárs in Tirhut to enter into new engagements (Kabúliyats), and requesting orders thereon. November 3.

1103. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing to be furnished with an account of the expense of the embankments for the last ten years, and directing Mr. Kinloch to proceed on a survey of their present state. November 3.

1104. Letter to Governor-General in Council, with sundry enclosures respecting the Behar rent free lands (Bází Zamín) superintendency. November 7.

1105. Letter to Governor-General in Council, with an account of expenses on account of the repair of embankments (pulbandí) for the last ten years; and reporting having given directions for a General Survey to be made of the actual state of the puls. November 10.

1106. Letter from Government Customs Collector of Huglí, stating that sundry foreign vessels are on the point of leaving the Settlement, and requesting to know if he is to detain any not paying Customs duties. November 7. Answered.

1107. Letter from Resident at Jaleswar, requesting permission either to conclude the Settlement at a lower assessment (Jamá) than last year, or to relinquish the old balances. November 28.

1108. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, forwarding Account Statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) of his District for 1192, etc. November 3.

1109. Order (Parwáná) to all Farmers, Zamíndárs, and Sazáwals in arrears, demanding immediate payment of their balances. November 21.

1110. Letter from Collector of Rohtás, pointing out the bad consequences likely to arise from Ahmad Alí Khán's holding such an extensive District. November 24.

## DECEMBER, 1785.

1111. Petition from Rájá of Bírbhúm, respecting the possessions of the French in that District. December 1.

1112. Petition from Bábar Alí Khán, pleading inability to discharge his balance, and praying to be released from confinement, in order to enable him to support his family. December 5.

1113. Petition from the Zamíndár of Baikunthpur, complaining that the Collector of Rangpur has laid an increase on his Zamíndárí, which he prays may be taken off. December 8.

1114. Petition from the Zamíndár of Jessor, delivering in a list of the villages Mr. Henckell has taken possession of, and which are included in his Hastobúd, or comparative statement of the assets and resources of the District. December 22.

1115. Petition from the landholders (Chaudhrís) of Huglí, representing that Mr. Henckell has granted Tálukdárí leases (Pattás) for several places belonging to their Zamíndárí. December 27.

1116. Letter from Mr. R. Bathurst, forwarding a petition from Parganá Ghyáspur, stating the effects of a storm in that Parganá, and submitting his opinion for the recovery of the revenue. December 1.

1117. Letter to Mr. Bathurst, in reply, agreeing that the Farmer be allowed to relinquish his Farm, and directing him to collect the revenues. December 1.

1118. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing him to report on the quantity of ground possessed by the French at Jugdiá before the late war. December 19.

1119. Letter to the Díwán, informing him of Mr. Foley's appointment to investigate the complaints of the rayats of Bírbhúm. December 5.

1120. Letter to Governor-General and Council, with extracts from the proceedings of the Provincial Council at Bardwán, relative to Jadu Sinh's Sanad for Bhográi Zamíndárí. December 5.

1121. Letter to Governor-General in Council, forwarding report on the state of the embankments and the repairs necessary. December 15.

1122. Letter to Governor-General in Council, with an Account Settlement of the Districts, concluded for the present Bengal and Behar year, etc. December 15.

1123. Letter from Resident at Jaleswar, relative to remission of rents (Jamá), and abolition of Hálbhanjan, or the practice of collecting revenues before they are due. December 15.

1124. Letter from Resident at Jaleswar, respecting the eligibility of concluding the Settlement at a lessened assessment (Jamá). December 22.

1125. Letter to Resident at Jaleswar, in reply, referring him to directions sent him on the 15th inst. December 22.

1126. Letter from Mr. Kinloch, Superintendant of Pulbandí, reporting on the state of the embankment (puls), and the repairs wanting. December 15.

1127. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, relative to his making the

settlement for 1193, and enclosing petitions for remissions. December 8.

1128. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, in reply, approving of his mode of proportioning the assessment, and directing him to conclude the settlement accordingly. December 8.

1129. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, complaining of depredations committed in his District by the Zamíndár of Rájsháhi. December 27.

1130. Letter from Chief of Patna, respecting the Settlement of Sháhábád, and the balances due by Ahmad Alí Khán. December 15.

1131. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, respecting an affray in Báliá Parganá. December 19.

1132. Letter from Chief of Purniah, in reply to the Committee's letter respecting Akráját. December 15.

1133. Order (Parwáná) to the Farmer of Bishnupur, directing him to refund the present money (Nazráná) taken from the Páíks, or military occupants of the Gháts, and to abstain from such exactions in future. December 1.

1134. Order (Parwáná) to Rádhá Charan Mitra, Díwán of Bírbhúm, dismissing him from the Service. December 5.

1135. Order (Parwáná) to Srínáráyan Mustafí of Rokanpur, threatening him with confinement and dismissal if he does not immediately liquidate his balance, and observe more punctuality in future. December 22.

1136. Order (Parwáná) to the Nágpur Rájá, threatening to dispossess him if he does not pay up his Revenues regularly. December 22.

1137. Letter to Collector of Rohtás, directing the release of Bábar Alí Khán upon his giving security for his appearance. December 5.

1138. Letter from Collector of Rohtás, requesting that Ahmad Alí Khán may be permitted to resign his farm of Sháhábád. December 5.

1139. Letter from Preparer of Reports, with his report relative to Jadu Sinh's Sanad for the Zamíndárí of Bhográi. December 5.

1140. Letter from Preparer of Reports, relative to the Makhlut or newly annexed Mahals of Bhuluá. December 5.

## JANUARY, 1786.

*From the year 1786 to 1793 the documents are not arranged in the strict chronological order of the Proceedings, but according to the dates of the Letters. These years were the first part of the work done, and the system which I then pursued was less perfect than the one subsequently adopted. As the numbers were regularly given under the earlier plan, however, the identification of the documents is sufficiently easy as to render it unnecessary to do the work over again.*

1141. Petition from Mirzá Muhammad to be confirmed in the possession of his lands. January 9; Nos. 5, 6.

1142. Collector of Chittagong forwards Sib Chandra's petition, relating to depredations by Pegus. January 9; Nos. 17, 28. Answered January 19; No. 20.

1143. Zamíndár of Rájnagar (Dacca) informed that his Zamíndárí will be sold for arrears. January 26.

1144. Petition from Mír Barkat Ullá complaining of encroachment on his land by the Amaldárs of Hájípur. January 30; No. 19a.

1145. Complaint against certain Tálukdárs by Shaikh Abdul Háibeg against Vakíl, who requests a writ (Dastak). January 30; No. 26.

1146. Collector of Chittagong forwards a menacing letter from the Pegu General. January 12; Nos. 4 to 6.

1147. Collector of Chittagong directed to defend his frontiers from the Pegus, but not to commence hostilities. January 23; No. 7.

1148. Collector of Behar authorized to rectify Kistbandís in concluding the settlement, with consent of renters whose engagements are not expired. January 5; No. 19.

1149. Registrar of Kánúngos directed to furnish a report on the state of his office. January 12. Replied to same day.

1150. Appointment of Ensign Duncanson to the command of the force for expelling the Sanyásís from Rangpur. January 30; No. 1.

1151. Chief of Dacca directed to enforce payment of all balances due by Zamíndárs. January 25; No. 11. Also directed to guard against the Sanyásís. January 26.

1152. Report to Governor-General in Council, on a complaint against the Kánúngo and Chaudhrí of Midnapur. January 9; No. 46.

1153. Report to Governor-General in Council respecting depredations by the Gorkhá (Nepal) Rájá. January 16; No. 4.

1154. Report to Governor-General in Council relative to depredations by Pegus (Barmese). January 19.

1155. Letter from Governor-General in Council confirming remissions to renters of Rangpur. January 17; Nos. 31 and 32.

1156. Governor-General in Council acquainted with Major Macdonald's having been directed to detach troops to protect Rangpur. January 26; No. 18.

1157. Letter from Governor-General in Council desiring an inquiry into the cause of the Arakan invasion, and approving of measures adopted by the Collector of Chittagong. January 26.

1158. Chief of Murshidábád directed to protect against depredations by the Sanyásís. January 5, No. 18; and January 26, No. 20.

1159. Report on complaint against the Kánúngo and Chaudhrí of Midnapur. Nov. 28, 1785; Nos. 42 to 45.

1160. Preparer of Accounts directed to report on the land disputes at Pukhuriá. January 30.

## FEBRUARY, 1786.

1161. Complaint against Rájá Bikrámárjit Sinh and the Chief of Patna. February 13; No. 12.

1162. Office Register of Kánúngo forwards the answers of the Náib Kánúngo to the questions put by the Register, by which the office appears of no use whatever. February 16; Nos. 23 and 24.

1163. Resolution, forwarded to Díwán, on the complaint of the Rájá of Bardwán against Chief of Patna. February 23.

1164. Letter to Governor-General in Council regarding land formerly possessed by the French at Jugdiá. February 6.

1165. Letter from Governor-General in Council, with a petition from the principal Zamíndárs regarding monthly allowance (Musháhará), and desiring a report to be furnished, stating (1) when the Musháhará commenced; (2) upon what account it was granted; (3) what income and allowances the Zamíndárs had before; and (4) what is in general the rights of the Zamíndárs according to the opinion of the Kánúngos and native officers of revenue. February 15; Nos. 14 and 14a.

1166. Renters of Tirhut and Hájípur informed that they will be dispossessed if they continue disobedient. February 1; No. 2.

1167. Collector of Húglí reports that Rájá Rámlochan has carried off by force the Gumáshtá (or the clerk in charge of the collections) of Parganá Jamirá. February 15; No. 16. Answered February 20.

1168. Collector of 24 Parganás informs that he has directed the Zamíndárs to send in their petitions, and recommending that the rayats may be granted copies of their respective leases. February 6; No. 36. Answered February 9.

1169. Informs Zamíndár of Mahmúdsháhí that should he remain in arrears at the end of the year his lands will be sold. February 23. (Several other similar notices to Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs.)

1170. Complaint of Durgá Dás, Tálukdár of Mahibúbpur. January 20.

1171. Secretary to the Committee directed to apply to Col. Macpherson for list of complaining rayats, to collate information regarding monthly allowance (Musháhará), and lay before Committee. February 9 and 16.

## MARCH, 1786.

1172. Petition of Sibrám Banju complaining that Kásinath Datta has taken possession of his Táluk. March 9; No. 5.

1173. Order (Parwánás) to Rájá and Kánúngos of Bardwán to furnish superintendent of rent-free lands (Bází Zamín) with the documents necessary for his investigation. March 13; No. 2.

1174. Collector of Bhágalpur to investigate petition of rayats of Joár Máldah and Phulbáriá against Mánik Chánd. March 24.

1175. Letter to Chief of Dacca regarding the sequestration of Prán Basu's lands in that District. March 24; No. 47.

1176. Díwán to report what amount Zamíndárs received as collections besides monthly allowance (Musháhará). March 9. Also directed to call upon Zamíndárs to furnish a detail of all Zamíndárí charges. March 27.

1177. Letter from Governor-General in Council approving of the proceedings of the Collector of Rangpur against Gorkhás, and directing him to report on the cause of the hostility by the Gorkhás. March 10; Nos. 10 to 12.

1178. Claim from Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs of Murshidábád for remission on account of inundations. March 13.

1179. Minute by Mr. Mackenzie, member of the Committee respecting petition of Zamíndárs. March 27.

1180. Order (Parwáná) to Rájá of Bardwán, stating that unless his Mágh instalment is at once discharged, his property will be attached. Ditto to Zamíndárs of Naulpur, Idrakpur, Dinájpur, and Rájsháhí. March 16.

1181. Collector of Sálbárís directed to put Syám Charan Sinh in possession of land decreed to him, and to arrest Alhyár Khán and send him prisoner to the Presidency. March 24; No. 22.

## APRIL, 1786.

1182. Zamíndár of Jesalpur requests an Order (Parwáná) for the encouragement of the rayats in cultivation. April 6; No. 35.

1183. Rámcharan Jíban Chaudhrí complains of usurpation of his Parganá by Rámdhan De. April 6; No. 32.

1184. Petition of rayats of Sátsiká in Nadiyá complaining of oppression by the Zamíndárs. March 18.

1185. Minute of Mr. Cooper, president of the Committee respecting the Zamíndárs' petition. April 6; No. 45.

1186. Order (Parwáná) to Major Crawford to arrest the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm, and send him to the Presidency. April 17; No. 6.

1187. Report from Mr. Foley of the despatch of the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm to the Presidency, and of the attachment of his property, and correspondence thereon. March 26; April 3, 8, and 17.

1188. Letter from Governor-General in Council forwarding resolutions respecting monthly allowance (Musháhará). April 7; Nos. 1 to 3.

1189. Letter to Governor-General in Council forwarding report on cause of disturbances at Rangpur. April 18; No. 36.

1190. Mr. Johnson's Minute on Zamíndárs' petition. April 18; No. 47.

1191. Order to attach private property of Zamíndár of Jaipur Meghná in Purniah. April 17; No. 17a.

1192. Complaint by Agent (Vakíl) of the Government estates (Khás Táluks) against the Zamíndár of Dinájpur. April 1; No. 19.

1193. Letter from Secretary to Revenue Department respecting Taksím Jamá Sumárí of the Subah of Bengal. April 7; No. 2.

## MAY, 1786.

1194. Ahmad Alí Khán complaining of oppression by Mr. Bathurst. May 1; No. 27. Also Letter from Mr. Bathurst asking for an Order (Parwáná) to compel Ahmad Alí Khán to pay up his balances. May 1, No. 28; and May 23, No. 19.

1195. Collector of Chittagong reporting on the cause of the invasion by the Pegus. April 22; Nos. 35 and 36.

1196. Circular Letter to all Chiefs and Collectors respecting abolition of monthly allowance (Musháhará). May 4; Nos. 3 and 4a.

1197. Chief of Patna complaining of exactions by Khálsá Peons from the Kánúngos. April 15; No. 42. Answered May 1; No. 43.

1198. Complaint by rayats of Bírbhúm against the Zamíndárs. March 7; Nos. 63 and 64.

## JUNE, 1786.

1199. Letter from Collector of Rangpur enclosing one from Rájá of Nepál containing assurances of friendship, etc. May 14; Nos. 25 to 27. Answered June 12.

1200. Petition from Kaldá rayats complaining of extortion, etc. July 3; Nos. 42 and 43. Answered same day.

## JULY, 1786.

1201. Letter from Governor-General in Council regarding dispossession of Zamíndár of Bírbhúm. July 19; No. 1.

1202. Letter from Chief of Purniah, reporting that, owing to the dissatisfaction of the rayats at the conduct of Zamíndár of Shujápur, he had advertised to farm the District. June 22; No. 31. Answered July 3.

1203. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí directing the Zamíndár to refund amount of robbery of revenue at Báhárband. July 18; No. 26.

1204. Collector of Tirhut authorized to make Takáví advances on account of epidemic among cattle. July 3; No. 24.

## AUGUST, 1786.

1205. Letter from Chief of Bozargomedpur, with a petition requesting release of the Rájnagar Zamíndár. August 3.

1206. Letter to Governor-General in Council complaining of depredation and murder by people of Parganá Pukhuriá. August 10.

## SEPTEMBER, 1786.

1207. Petition from legal agent (Vakíl) of Rájsháhi complaining that the Zamíndár of Táherpur has dispossessed him of Talúk Mahipurá. September 14.

1208. Petition from Phitkárá Zamíndár complaining of annulment of his Settlement for 1193, and requesting to be put in possession of his Zamíndárí. September 21.

1209. Letter to Collector of Midnapur enclosing one from Governor-General in Council to the Rájá of Cattack, regarding disturbances at Partában. September 5.

1210. Mr. J. Stables' opinion regarding order for removing the Zamíndárí papers of Rokanpur. September 21.

1211. Mr. J. Stables' opinion regarding the Settlement of Phitkárá. September 21.

1212. Collector of Silhet complaining of resistance to Collecting Officers. September 5.

## OCTOBER, 1786.

1213. Petition from Zamíndár of Gangámandal urging his claim for Phitkárá. October 4.

1214. Petition from Zamíndár of Phitkárá complaining of his dispossession, and requesting to be allowed a monthly allowance (Musháhará). October 10.

1215. Report by Mr. J. Evelyn on the custom in the Dacca Province to allow monthly allowance (Musháhará) to dispossessed Zamíndárs. October 10.

1216. Letter from Chief of Patna enclosing a petition from persons remonstrating against an order for the sale of their lands. October 10.

1217. Order to Mr. J. Stables, President, to proceed with the Settlement of Behar and Orissa without any delay. October 3.

1218. Distribution of Takávi advances to Collector of Tirhut authorized by the Board of Revenue on 10th August. October 10.

1219. Complaint from the Zamíndár of Tipperah forwarded to Collector. October 17.

## NOVEMBER, 1786.

1220. Petition from Rájá Rámlochan complaining of being dispossessed of certain villages. November 23.

1221. Collector of Bhágalpur directed to give his reasons for the dispossession of Zamíndárs of Bhágalpur and Chaliá. November 28.

1222. Petition of Zamíndár of Chandhrí to Collector of Bhuluá requesting to be put in possession of lands usurped from him by Jai Náráyan Ghoshal. November 20.

1223. Letter from Chief of Dacca forwarding correspondence regarding French possessions in the Province. November 28.

1224. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur reporting that he has confined Jánakirám Sinh owing to his inability to pay his balances. November 23.

1225. Letter from Governor-General in Council approving of amount fixed as Nazráná, or installation fee, on his succession to the office of Kánúngo, and directing that the rate of Peshkásh, or fee for succession to Zamíndárís, be rated at fifty mohars for each lakh of rupees revenue. November 17.

1226. Report from Mr. J. Mackenzie protesting against the dispossession of Rájá of Dinájpur and other Zamíndárs. November 6, 20, and 23.

1227. Collector of Mahmúdsháhí reports on the state of the country, and fears that at present the revenues cannot be realized. November 20.

1228. Chief of Murshidábád directed to suspend all collections of transit duties on boats (Gashti Mahals). November 28.

1229. Representation of Zamíndár to Collector of Rájsháhi, objecting to be made accountable for robbery committed of treasure. November 23. Investigation to take place. November 23.

1230. Collector of Rájsháhi authorized to dispossess Zamíndár in case of his failing to pay balance due. November 6.

## DECEMBER, 1786.

1231. Petition from Zamíndár of Rámnagar complaining of oppression in making collections of his revenue. December 5.

1232. Instructions to Collector of Dinájpur to reinstate Jánakirám, etc. December 29.

1233. Petition of rayats to Collector of Nadiyá complaining of oppression. December 21.

## JANUARY, 1787.

1234. Accountant-General directed to report on the sums paid to the dispossessed Zamíndárs of Jahángírpur since the abolition of monthly allowance (Musháhará). January 16.

1235. Petition from Mahádeb Ghosh complaining of oppressions by the French. Answered January 22.

1236. Zamíndár of Muhammadámínpur complaining of exactions by the Collector of Húglí and his officers. January 30.

1237. Collector of Bishnupur forwards petition of the Zamíndár, complaining of interference by the Gumáshtá of Kuli Patarsháhí in confining the Tahsíldár of Puruliá. December 27; Nos. 26 and 27. Answered January 30.

1238. Petition of rayats of Role (?) against the same Gumáshtá. December 30. Answered January 30.

1239. Collector of Chittagong recommends remission on account of damages caused by a storm and encroachments of the sea. December 28. Answered January 20.

1240. Chief of Dacca enclosing a petition from rayats of Gangámandal and Phitkárá complaining of oppression from bordering Tahsíldárs. January 4. Replied to January 16.

1241. Letter to Governor-General in Council, giving reasons why the Zamíndár of Bhográi could not be restored to possession of his land. January 18; No. 26.

1242. Letter to Governor-General in Council, with Mr. Duncan's reply to complaints preferred by the late landholders (Chaudhrís) of Maihátí of improper influence in the sale of their land. January 18; No. 52.

1243. Chief of Purniah assigning reasons for decrease in Settlement, and also dispossession of the Zamíndár of Súrjyapur, whom he had lately reinstated. November 25; No. 30. Answered January 22.

1244. Petition of Zamíndár of Ramgarh and farmer of Palámau claiming remissions on account of the late orders prohibiting the Ráhádárí and Chalantá or passport duties levied by the Zamíndárs on goods passing through their estates. January 15; Nos. 22 to 24. Answered January 22.

1245. Preparer of Reports forwards a petition from Táriní Sankar against Madan Datta relative to her title to land in 24 Parganás. May 27, 1786. Answered January 18.

1246. Report by Preparer of Accounts on complaints preferred by the landholders (Chaudhrís) of Maihátí of undue influences exercised by the Khálsá officers in selling their lands. January 5; Nos. 47 to 51. Answered January 18.

1247. Collector of Rangpur forwards petition from the Rání of Ghorághát respecting outrages practised by Gokul Kánt Rái to obtain the Zamíndárí of her late husband. November 16; Nos. 29a to 29c. Answered January 18.

1248. Secretary to General Department forwards petition from the Tálukdárs of Parganá Bara Gosáin, complaining of oppression of the French. January 15; Nos. 2 and 3. Answered January 22.

1249. Collector of Sálbárís reports that Alhyár Khán disturbs the country by his invasions, and requests orders on the subject of his continued disobedience. September 17, 1786; No. 35. Answered January 30, 1787.

## FEBRUARY, 1787.

1250. Petition from Lok Náth Nandi requesting the Board to reconsider his right to collect revenue from rayats of Báharband, agreeably to a settlement (Jamábandí) he made in 1189. February 9; No. 48. Answered February 20.

1251. Petition from Zamíndár of Gangámandal disclaiming the right of Mirzá Ján to the Zamíndárí of Phiṭkárá, and requesting that the order for paying him Musháhará may be rescinded; also representing obstructions caused by an order (Parwáná) issued by the Dacca Chief, and requesting to be released from his engagements. February 9; No. 20. Answered February 13.

1252. Letter from Superintendent of the office of the rent-free lands (Bází Zamín Daftar), representing the disinclination of the Zamíndár of Bardwán to assist him with necessary records for investigating the state of the rent-free lands (Bazí Zamín), and suggests propriety of inquiry into Chitá Bháunriá and Arkal papers of each village. February 20; No. 21. Answered February 27.

1253. Collector of Bhuluá reports resistance by one Rámkamal Chattarji to giving up to Gangánáráin possession of villages awarded him, and his contumacy in collecting the transit (Ráhádárí and Chalantá) duties. January 25; No. 8. Answered

February 6. Further letters on the same subject. January 29; February 1, 6.

1254. Collector of Chittagong recommending remission to rayats on account of damages by a storm. January 22; 41, 42. Answered February 20.

1255. Circular Letter to Chiefs and Collectors, directing them, preparatory to the ensuing year's Settlement, to report whether any new taxes have been imposed by the Zamíndárs during the last three years, and whether the Zamíndárs or farmers exercise any oppression; the report to be accompanied by any remarks on the imperfections of the present system of collection. Also to furnish an account of such landholders as may have been dispossessed since the Company's accession, together with an historical account of the Zamíndárs, pointing out the alterations which may have happened in their succession, etc. etc. Date not given. February.

1256. Letter from Governor-General in Council sanctioning remission proposed by Collector of Midnapur in Settlement of 1194. January 29.

1257. Mr. Grant, Head Ministerial Officer (Sarishtádár), ordered to prepare a series of queries pointing out information required for ascertaining rights of Zamíndárs. February 20.

1258. Collector of Lashkarpur informs that he has attached certain property till the disputed title of two Zamíndárs is settled. January 23; Nos. 30 and 31. Answered February 20.

1259. Collector of Mahmudsháhí submits propriety of selling lands of such Tálukdárs as refuse to pay their balances to the Zamíndárs, or keeping them khás, and renewing the grants to more solvent persons. September 15, 1786. Answered February 6, 1787. Further letters, October 9, 12, and November 4, 1786.

1260. Chief of Murshidábád forwards petition from the Zamíndár of Hatandá, requesting release of Syám Rái and another, confined on account of a robbery committed at Jagannáthpur. August, 1786. Answered February 27, 1787.

1261. Chief of Patna reports seizure of the Zamíndár of Dinolá, and requests his punishment for former resistance to orders. November 18; No. 44. Answered February 20, 1787.

1262. Rání of Rájsháhí informed that her land will be sold to liquidate balances. February 6, No. 20; February 9, No. 7; and February 16, No. 6.

1263. Ráí Ráyán ordered to lay before the Board all the information in his power relative to the proposed arrangement of the country into Collectorships. February 20.

1264. The Ráí Ráyán directed to prepare account of annual revenue of each District from Company's accession. February 20.

1265. Letter from Governor-General in Council directing new arrangement of country into Collectorships. February 5. Answered February 16.

## MARCH, 1787.

1266. Collector of Bardwán reporting on the Zamíndár's inability to pay up all his instalments. February 28; No. 20. Answered March 13.

1267. Letter from Collector of Húglí reporting on complaint preferred against him by the Zamíndár of Muhammadáminpur. March 1; 3 to 7. Answered March 13.

1268. Letter from Chief of Murshidábád, proscribing Mánik Chánd from renting any lands in the Company's possession. March 20; No. 61.

1269. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, intimating that collections embezzled by the Zamíndár can only be realized by sale of his estate. February 25; No. 20b. Answered March 13.

1270. Order (Parwáná) to Rájá of Nadiyá on subject of his balance. March 20; No. 31.

1271. Collector of Rájsháhi submitting propriety of appointing an Amín to settle complaints made by the rayats. March 17; No. 12. Answered March 23.

1272. Collector of Rangpur reports that Rání of Kuch Behar quitted her district without receiving his answer to her application for leave. March 15; No. 18. Answered March 23; No. 19.

1273. Collector of Rangpur represents necessity of severity, and even of dispossession, in case of Zamíndárs in arrears. March 1; No. 19. Answered March 27; No. 20.

1274. Mr. J. Shore's Minute regarding division of country into Collectorships. March 13, Nos. 1 to 6; and March 20, Nos. 5, 6.

1275. Letter from Mr. W. B. Smith, representing that the Zamíndár of Nátor has sent Sazáwals to dispossess new settlers of Nishánpur Kur Mahals, although they have regularly paid their rents. February 28; No. 40. Answered March 22.

1276. Letter to Collector of Tirhut, to direct the Zamíndár of Nátor to recall the Sazáwals despatched by him. March 13; No. 41.

## APRIL, 1787.

1277. Accountant-General lays before the Board an abstract of the division of the three Provinces into Collectorships, according to the new arrangements. April 1; Nos. 16 and 17. Answered April 10.

1278. Petition from Sibram Bhanj complaining of dispossession of Táluk Gudná by one Kási Náth Datta. April 13.

1279. Petition from Malangís of 24 Parganás complaining of oppression by the Zamíndár. April 24.

1280. Collector of Bardwán gives an historical account of the several successions to the Zamíndárí of Bardwán, and reports that no new taxes have been levied from the rayats for the last three years. April. Date not given.

1281. Chief of Purniah recommending Takávi advances to rayats. April 5; No. 60. Answered April 17.

1282. Report from Chief of Patna regarding the present system of collecting the revenue, respecting cultivation, new taxes, alienations, Pattás, etc., to rayats, etc. March 6; No. 48.

1283. Report from Collector of Rájsháhí respecting present system of collecting the revenue, regarding new taxes, cultivation, and undefined duties and rights of the Zamíndárs, etc. etc.; accompanied by an Instalment statement (Kistbandí) adapted to the Mufassal collections. March 31. Answered April 17.

1284. Rái Ráyán to report his and the Kánúngo's opinion respecting right of Government to appropriate waste lands. April 17.

1285. Letter from Chief of Dacca recommending an investigation into the oppressions by the Zamíndárs in Phitkárá, and enclosing a paper in support of Mirzá Ján's claim to the latter Parganá. March 9. Answered April 20.

1286. Zamíndár of Húglí called on to pay amount withheld on account of monthly allowance (Musháhará), in default of which his land will be sold. April 24; No. 22.

## MAY, 1787.

1287. Report from Collector of Bírbhúm on the state of the khás col-

lections, and claims for remission. April 12; No. 2. Answered May 1.

1288. Collector of Bishnupur reports respecting system of collecting revenue, new taxes, oppression exercised by the Zamíndárs, etc. March 9; No. 5. Answered May 1.

1289. Collector of Bhágalpur reports that no new taxes have been levied nor any oppressions exercised by the Zamíndárs in his District. March 9; No. 34. Answered May 11.

1290. Collector of Bardwán forwards report on complaint of the weavers against the Ijárádár of Chandrakoná. March 24. Answered May 11.

1291. Collector of Bozargomedpur reports on present system of collecting revenue, oppression exercised by the Zamíndárs, etc. March 6; No. 28. Answered May 1.

1292. Letter to Collector of Patna forbidding the Zamíndárs of Sháhábád to infringe the rayats Pattás. May 18; No. 52.

1293. Collector of Silhet reports that Rádhárám, who had laid several of the villages under contribution, and murdered a number of the inhabitants, had been arrested, and that a Police Officer (Thánádár) and twenty men had been killed by the Hill people during an expedition against them, and also forwarding an account of the expedition. March 30; 58 and 59. Answered May 4.

1294. Collector of Silhet expresses his apprehension of famine in consequence of inundations. April 28; No. 52. Replied May 11.

1295. Letter to Board of Trade enclosing report respecting complaint of weavers of Iotia against the Ijárádár of Chandrakoná, together with regulations proposed by the Collector to prevent such disputes in future. May 11; No. 105.

## JUNE, 1787.

1296. Collector of Dinájpur reports sending Jánakirám Sinh in custody to the Presidency, in consequence of his non-compliance with the Board's order (Parwáná). March 30; No. 44. Answered June 15.

1297. Letters to Governor-General in Council reporting dismissal of Jánakirám Sinh from the management of the Zamíndárí of Dinájpur. June 19; No. 14.

1298. Collector of Rámgarh recommends dispossession of the Zamíndár

of Nágpur on account of his misdemeanour in levying new taxes on the rayats. March 23; No. 73. Replied June 22.

## JULY, 1787.

1299. Report from Collector of Chittagong on the state of the country about Tipperah, owing to inundations and breaking down of embankments (bandhs). July 15; Nos. 44 and 45. Answered July 31.

1300. Circular Letter to Collectors, directing that where Zamíndárs decline engaging for the revenue, a written declaration be taken from them to that effect, and that in cases of farms (except when given for crimes or disqualifications of the landholders) a provision be stipulated for the dispossessed Zamíndárs, etc. July 5; No. 2a.

1301. Collector of Maimansinh reports on the condition of the country owing to inundation, and encloses a representation from the Zamíndárs of a list of Mahals which have particularly suffered. July 19; Nos. 38 to 43. Answered July 31.

1302. Collector of Murshidábád reports that, on account of the refusal of the Zamíndárs of Fathi Sinh to pay their balances, he has despatched a Sazáwal to attach their lands. July 4; No. 66.

1303. Collector of Tirhut recommends suspension of remainder of rents of the year owing to inundations. July 6; Nos. 7 and 8. Answered July 20.

1304. Collector of Customs, Murshidábád, reporting scarcity of grain in the District. July 21; Nos. 12 to 15. Answered July 31.

1305. Letter from Collector of Jessor on utility of employing dacoits confined in criminal (Fauzdárí) prisons in clearing jungle. July 23; No. 36. Answered July 27.

1306. Collector of Silhet representing the state of country on account of the inundations, and reporting that balances are withheld by the Zamíndárs in consequence. July 11; No. 36. Answered July —; No. 37.

## AUGUST, 1787.

1307. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting a plan of the President for forming a settlement of the Districts for a term of years; calling particular attention to the following for inquiry and report—(1) the amount of assessment (Jamá), (2) the person with

whom the settlement is to be made, and (3) rules for preventing oppression to the rayats by the Zamíndárs and their farmers. August 10; No. 3.

1308. Letter to Governor-General in Council submitting two applications for remission of rents (Jamá) proposed by the Collector of Murshidábád, and stating the reasons for them. August 14; No. 14.

1309. Letter to Governor-General in Council relative to balance of Rám Chandrapur, amounting to Rs. 170, soliciting instructions whether the balance shall be relinquished, or the Táluk put up for sale. August 21; No. 6.

1310. Letter to Governor-General in Council regarding depredations committed by Musá Sháh in Dinájpur. August 31; No. 36.

1311. Collector of Patna reports having confined Kumár Rámnáráyan owing to his failing in paying his balances. July 31; No. 35. Answered August 16. Letter to Collector directing him to attach Kumár Náráyan's property in hands of his relatives, or any belonging to the renters themselves, and also directing that Kumár Náráyan's security be immediately confined. August 16.

1312. Letter to Collector of Tirhut authorizing him to grant, in consequence of inundation, such indulgence to renters as might be absolutely necessary. August 17; No. 22.

## SEPTEMBER, 1787.

1313. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, reporting on present system of collecting revenues, the adjusting accounts with the Zamíndárs, with remarks on duties of Kánúngos, etc., and on the abuse of their offices. September 21; No. 7. Answered September 22.

## OCTOBER, 1787.

1314. Letter from Collector of Dacca forwarding a petition from Tálukdárs, farmers, etc., complaining of rigorous exactions by the Zamíndárs of Nurullápur. October 3; No. 15c.

1315. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing him to investigate the above complaint, and refund any undue exactions made. October 26; No. 17.

## NOVEMBER, 1787.

1316. Petition from Zamíndár of Nadiyá, complaining that, although his balance had been paid at the Khálsá, yet his Parganá of Kabuzápur was sold to Tárá Chánd Mitra. November 9.

## DECEMBER, 1787.

1317. Collector of Behar directed to suspend his demand of customary present money (Nazráná) from the Dutch. December 28; No. 20.

1318. Collector of Bardwán reports respecting the enforcement of payment of the revenues after the late inundation, without an investigation being made into the damages sustained thereby;—gives a detail of the late storm, and states what Parganás particularly suffered. November 28; Nos. 31 to 34. Answered December 7.

1319. Circular to Collectors, intimating that the Board has granted a temporary suspension on all duties on grain, owing to the inclemency of the season. December 14; No. 5.

1320. Circular to Collectors of Murshidábád, Dinájpur, Purniah, Bhágalpur, and Calcutta, directing them to require from the Zamíndárs in the vicinity of Jagannáthpur their several proportions to make good the robbery committed on the Factory at that place, as inflicted by the late Náib Názím, according to the enclosed distribution; reporting the same to the Board when paid. December 28; No. 40.

1321. Collector of Dinájpur reports of his Sazáwal at the Court (Kachárí) of Parganá Chaugáon having been attacked by the armed peons (Barkandáz) belonging to the Zamíndár, in consequence of which he has called upon the Commanding Officer to support the officers sent to apprehend the aggressors. November 21; 45 and 46. Replied to December 7.

1322. Letter from Governor-General in Council approving measures taken by the Collector of Murshidábád for the apprehension of Majnú Khán and his followers. December 7.

1323. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting copy of letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, respecting seizing and bringing down to Calcutta one of the Zamíndárs of Char Dilaurí, by an officer of the Supreme Court. December 11; No. 8. Answered December 11.

1324. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing the Board to call for a description of the Khasiás, their nature and habit of life, and whether by lenient measures they might not be brought under regular government. November 28; No. 6. Answered December 7.

1325. Mr. T. Graham to write a Parwáná or order to Zamíndár of Bardwán, acquainting him that the non-payment of his instalment has again incurred the displeasure of Government, and that, unless he shall be more regular in his future payments, measures of severity will be resorted to. December 14.

## JANUARY, 1788.

1326. Petition from Rái Gaur Hari, requesting to be allowed to alter the mode of paying his revenue to Government. January 24; No. 28.

1327. Collector of Behar's report on question referred to him respecting the division of grants. December 14; No. 7.

1328. Letter to Collector in reply to the above, informing him that his report is unsatisfactory, and particularly requiring a statement of the several instances that have occurred in his Collectorate since the Company's accession to the Díwání, as well of the resumption as the continuance of Jágírs on the death of the Grantee. January 3; No. 3.

1329. Superintendent of Rent-free Lands (Bází Zamín Daftar) forwards an account of forfeitures collected on account of Government from sundry proprietors of rent-free lands (Bází Zamín) in the 24 Parganás, Jaleswar, etc. January 24; No. 32. Answered January 25.

1330. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, conveying an explanation relative to his deviation from the Revenue Regulations, in taking securities, etc., and stating that he was guided in making his Kistbandí by the circumstances of the country. December 26; No. 4. Answered January 15, No. 5, informing him that the Board cannot admit his reasons in the above instance of taking securities, as the Regulations were meant to relieve the Zamíndár, and not to oppress him. January 15; No. 5.

1331. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, directing him to attach Zamíndár's own home-farm (Níj Jot), and other private lands, unless some provision is made for discharging the balances due. January 29; No. 76.

1332. Collector of Bardwán reports in reply to Board's letter on damages sustained in consequence of inundation. January 5; No. 23. Answered January 22, in which the Board referred him to the opinion of the Governor-General in Council respecting distress felt by the rayats owing to calamities of the season, and informing him the Board cannot admit a local investigation in his District. January 22; No. 25.

1333. Letter from Mr A. Caldecott, reporting result of his investigation on the effects of inundation in Midnapur. December 31; No. 5. Answered January 11.

1334. Letter to Mr. A. Caldecott, expressing the satisfaction of the Board for the ability and despatch with which he has executed the above commission, and for information respecting revenues of the Midnapur Parganás. January 11; No. 6.

1335. Letter from Mr. A. Caldecott, replying to questions concerning the resources of the Midnapur Zamíndarí. January 13; No. 14.

1336. Circular Letter to all Collectors, directing them to report on present prospects of grain crops in their respective Districts; whether the prices of grain are comparatively higher or lower than in the past two years; and how far the quantity may be supposed to be adequate to provide for the internal consumption, and allow the usual exportation. January 15; No. 32a.

1337. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, enclosing two letters from the Commanding Officer at Táujipur: (1) respecting Musá Sháh having again assembled his forces, and was again committing depredations; and (2) recommending the execution of every tenth man taken in arms, and should Musá himself be taken, strongly recommends that he should be hanged without ceremony. December 3; Nos. 11 to 13.

1338. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, transmitting petition from Zamíndár of Barbakpur, complaining of sundry persons, calling themselves agents of the Nawáb Mubárakuddaulá, having collected money from the rayats in his employ. December 30; Nos. 23 to 25.

1339. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, directing him to issue an order (Parwáná) prohibiting similar exactions in future. January 11; No. 26.

1340. Letter from Governor-General in Council, requesting to be informed if there is any apprehension of a scarcity of grain before the next crops ripen. January 5; No. 32.

1341. Letter to Governor-General in Council in reply to the above, enclosing extract of a letter from Collector of Government Customs at Murshidábád, informing of artifices practised by the grain merchants to occasion an apparent scarcity, and raise the price of grain. January 25; No. 21.

1342. Collector of Maimansinh directed to issue an advertisement to the effect that if Mirzá Muhammad Alí, Tálukdár, does not appear in six weeks, his Táluk will be sold. January 29.

1343. Collector of 24 Parganás reports on acts of violence and outrages committed by a French merchant on rayats at and near Barrackpur, and forwards petitions on that subject from several persons. January 24.

1344. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, transmitting a representation from the Rájá of Kuch Behar, requesting a reinforcement of a Lieutenant and twenty men, to prevent the incursions of Khagendra Náráyan. December 19; Nos. 27 and 28.

1345. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, enclosing copy of a petition from Ahmad Alí Khán, stating his inability to pay his balances of last year, and gives his reasons for deviating from the letter and spirit of the Revenue Regulations, which he hopes will meet the approbation of the Board. December 24; Nos. 29 and 30.

1346. In answer to above, Board approve of his compliance with Ahmad Alí Beg's request, but direct that specific engagements may be entered into by him to pay his balance within a limited period. January 8; No. 31.

1347. Collector of Silhet complains that Zamíndár of Baniá-chung has withheld his revenue from Government. December 17; No. 18.

1348. Letter to Collector of Silhet in reply to the above, directing that, in the event of the Zamíndár still persisting in his refusal to pay his balance, the 23d and 24th Articles of Revenue Regulations be enforced. January 11; No. 19.

1349. Letter to Collector of Behar, agreeing to allow him Rs. 10,000 as an advance for the repair of embankments (Gilandází), and desiring him to see it properly distributed among the cultivators, taking bonds from them for the sums so advanced, payable in the ensuing year. January 11; No. 33.

1350. Letter from Collector of Government Customs, Murshidábád, in reply to Circular Orders of Board, informs the Board that the price of grain is risen to a scandalous degree by the combination of the merchants, in consequence of the order of Govern-

ment for a suspension of the duty; that he can form no idea of the quantity in market, as the merchants bring it from their stores little by little; and that if some measures are not taken to have it produced, the consequences will be alarming. January 22; No. 17.

1351. Collector of Rangpur forwards an account of the quantity of rice distributed during late famine. January 2; No. 36.

## FEBRUARY, 1788.

1352. Petition from Malangis of Háthiágarh, complaining of exactions made by the Zamíndárs beyond the Jamábandí of their lands. February 19.

1353. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, directing him to call upon the Rájá to pay his balances within five days, and to put the 23d Article of Revenue Regulations in force if the demand be not complied with. February 1.

1354. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, directing him to attach the property of the Zamíndár of Barbakpur if he fails in discharging his balance. February 4.

1355. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, enclosing copy of an order (Parwáná) issued by him, directing the sale daily in the bázárs of Rájáganj of a proportion of the rice hoarded up. February 12.

1356. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur in reply to above, desiring him to remove the above restraint if the grain merchants will engage to send the necessary supplies to market; and in case of refusal, refer him to Circular Order of the Governor-General in Council relative to prevention of monopolies. February 19.

1357. Letter from Governor-General in Council, exempting from general embargo against exportation of grain, all such grain as the Board might consider necessary for crews of ships during their voyage from this port. February 5.

1358. Collector of Huglí reports that considerable distress exists among the rayats from the excessive price at which rice is sold. February 6.

1359. Letter to Collector of Sháhábád, authorizing him to advance the sum of Rs.20,000 as Gilandází, for losses arising from death of cattle, and from delay in measurement of lands, owing to heavy rains. February 12.

1360. Report from Collector of Silhet that no grain exists in the District, and that the only relief expected is from the harvest in May, and recommending that 20,000 maunds of rice be sent into the District. February 8.

1361. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, expressing his fears that, if rigorous measures are adopted towards the Rájá, he will continue to oppress his farmers and rayats, etc., whose distresses are now much increased by the death of their cattle. February 8; No. 20.

1362. Letter to Collector of Bardwán in reply to the above, remarking that he ought to hear the complaints of the rayats, and prevent oppression, and to insist on the Rájá's affording them relief, without interfering, however, in his just demands upon the farmers. February 15; No. 24.

## MARCH, 1788.

1363. Letter to Collector, Bírbhúm, directing him to take care that the Zamíndárs and farmers of such Districts as have suffered from inundation, do not enforce with severity their demands upon the rayats. March 22; No. 13.

1364. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, remarking his neglect in not having enforced the 23d Article of the Regulations, in consequence of the Rájá not having paid up his balances, and informing him that the state of his collections will be particularly notified to the Governor-General in Council. March 7; No. 26.

1365. Collector of Bardwán reports that, as the Rájá had paid no portion of his instalment for Mágh, he had put him in confinement, agreeable to the Regulations. March 8; No. 2.

1366. Letter to Collector of Dacca, informing him that the Zamíndár of Nurullápur is confined at the Khálsá, and desiring him to report any payments which may have been made by the Zamíndár's officers on account of his balances. March 11; No. 41.

1367. Collector of Ramgarh reports that 10,000 maunds of rice might be exported out of his District. February 22; No. 21.

1368. Collector of Sháhábád reports that the state of grain in his District will allow of an exportation of 4 lakhs of maunds. February 20; No. 11.

1369. Collector of Silhet reports on the deplorable state of the District

from the late inundation and inroad of Khasiás. February 11; No. 55. Answered March 7; No. 56.

1370. Collector of Dacca reports great distress among the people owing to the importation of rice not keeping pace with the demand for consumption. February 16; No. 45. Answered, March 28; No. 46.

## APRIL, 1788.

1371. Collector of Bírbhúm directed to inform the Zamíndár of Bishnupur, that if the amount of his balance is not discharged in three days, his land will be sold. April 25; No. 23.

1372. Collector of Bardwán reports that in consequence of a proposal from the Zamíndár to discharge his instalment, he had suspended attaching the Rájá's property. April 10; Nos. 36 and 37. Answered, April 15.

1373. Collector of Bardwán is informed, in answer to the above, that his conduct is highly reprehensible in suspending the Board's orders on the above subject, and stating that his conduct will be reported to the Governor-General in Council. April 15; No. 38.

1374. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, enclosing petition from the Zamíndár and Tálukdár of Midnapur and Jaleswar, representing the distress of the rayats from the enhanced prices of salt. March 10; No. 37. Answered April 4.

1375. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, enclosing petition from several rayats representing that the merchants (Mahájans) refuse to sell them any grain. April 22; No. 28.

1376. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing one from Collector of Maimansinh, reporting the measures taken by him to apprehend a refractory and defaulting Tálukdár under his authority. April 15; No. 14.

1377. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh, reporting oppression and outrages by Kiritnáráyan, Tálukdár of Sántisitá, on the peons of the Sazáwal of the newly annexed (Makhlut) land of Bhuluá, and his having therefore given instruction to have him seized, and his Táluk confiscated. April 8 and 10; Nos. 9 to 12.

1378. Letter to Collector of Maimansinh, in reply to the above, informing him that the confiscation of Kiritnáráyan's Táluk has been approved of by the Governor-General in Council, and directing him to send the offender to the Faujdárí Court for trial.

## MAY, 1788.

1379. Petition from Rájá of Nadiyá, requesting that his allowance of Musháhará be restored to him. May 22; Nos. 2 and 3.

1380. Petition from Rámnáráyan and Hari Náráyan Gosáin, reporting that Kálí Prasád Pál and others have unjustly possessed themselves of 14 villages, which the complainants had purchased at public auction. May 20; No. 42.

1381. Petition from Ráni of Idrakpur, regarding succession to her Zamíndárí. May 30.

1382. Collector of Bírbhúm replies to orders respecting the formation of a general Settlement for a term of years, and transmits a form of lease (Pattá) to be granted to the rayats. January 18.

1383. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, with instructions for the Settlement of 1195, and directing him to advertise for sale a portion of the Zamíndár's lands in liquidation of balance of revenue. May 16; No. 29.

1384. Collector of Bhágalpur requests to be furnished with an order (Parwáná) expressive of the Board's determination to dispose of the lands of such of the Zamíndárs of Rájmahal as shall be in balance at the end of the year. February 26; No. 12.

1385. Collector of Bardwán forwards a list of the Rájá's effects under attachment, and informs the Board that he has communicated to the Rájá the orders for relieving the rayats and furnishing an account statement (Mufassal Jamá Wásil Bákí). April 29; Nos. 8 and 9.

1386. Circular Letter to Collectors, directing them to report whether the regulations established by the ordinance for the police of Calcutta could be introduced in the principal towns of the several Districts. May 2; No. 47.

1387. Circular Letter, directing all Collectors to give timely notice, before the conclusion of the year, of any remission which may be deemed necessary at the formation of the ensuing Settlement. May 27; No. 29.

1388. Circular Letter to Collectors, enclosing copy of orders from Governor-General in Council, regarding the line of conduct to be observed by the Collector in cases of general combination of the rayats against the collection of the just revenues of Government. May 27; No. 32.

1389. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing a code of Regulations for the conduct of the Board of Revenue. April 25; Nos. 3 and 4.

1390. Letter from Collector of Jessor, reporting the necessity of distributing Takávi advances. May 9; No. 22.

1391. Letter to Collector of Jessor, in reply, informing him that his application for Takávi has been forwarded to Government, and authorizing him, until their orders be known, to advance Takávi to an amount not exceeding 5 per cent. of the Jamá payable to Government. May 13; No. 24.

1392. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh, reporting that Kiritnáráyan, Tálukdár of Sántisitá, had been seized and made over to the Faujdárí Court. April 21; No. 29. Replied to May 9.

1393. Collector of Murshidábad requests instructions regarding the disputed rights to the village of Bodherá. December 11, 1787; Nos. 3, 4.

1394. Collector of Nadiyá recommends remissions being made to the Farmer of Buran, on account of losses from the late calamities. May 3; Nos. 4 and 5. Answered May 9, when Board declined to forward this application to the Governor-General unless it was supported by proofs.

1395. Collector of Purniah represents necessity of making advances to the rayats who suffered from the late calamities. April 30; No. 26. Answered May 9, authorizing him to advance Rs. 10,000 as Takávi, and to report where this advance was required.

1396. Collector of Rájsháhí informed that the Board has fined him Rs. 300 for not sending in his Revenue Accounts (Taují) for Chaitra in proper time. May 23; No. 11.

1397. Collector of Sháhábád proposes the release of Bishárat Alí Khán and Esah John from their confinement, as he sees no probability of ever recovering the balance due from them to Ahmad Alí Khán. May 10; No. 45. Answered May 16, No. 46, approving the above measures if Ahmad Alí Khán will acquiesce in the release of the above prisoners.

1398. Collector of Tirhut reports that he has farmed three divisions of Bisorá, and the whole of Kasmár, at a reduced assessment (Jamá), but only after a full inquiry into the Mufassal assets. April 3; No. 22. Answered May 6, No. 26, directing him to restore the Jamá to the amount they stood at in 1194, and

informing him that he will be held responsible for any deficiency at the close of the year.

1399. Collector of Rangpur encloses a petition from the Ráni of Idrakpur soliciting a Sanad for the Zamíndárí, and protesting against the claims set up by the late Rájá's nephews. April 17; Nos. 18 and 19. Answered May 30, directing him that the management of the Zamíndárí should remain with the Ráni until the claim of succession should have been decided in the Rangpur Adálat.

1400. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing the Collector of Bírbhúm to apprehend all the persons concerned in the robbery and outrages committed at Báti, and ordering him to lay down rules to be observed in cases of combination and tumultuous assemblies of the rayats. May 21; Nos. 23 and 24.

1401. Letter to Governor-General in Council, proposing that it be made a Standing Regulation that no Landholder refusing to engage for his lands, shall be allowed to under-rent them from any Sazáwal appointed by Government. May 27; No. 30.

## JUNE, 1788.

1402. Petition from Kapil Náráyan Chaudhrí, Zamíndár of Parganá Dharpur in Purniah, complaining of his land being usurped by Bodái Dás Kánúngo, and prays for relief. June 17; No. 4.

1403. Petition from Rájá of Bardwán, stating his inability to discharge his arrears, by reason of the calamitous state of his District. June 27; Nos. 7, 8.

1404. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, stating that he has called upon the Zamíndár for the payment of his part of the contribution to be levied in consequence of the robbery at Jagannáthpur. February 1; No. 61.

1405. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of remissions recommended by the Collector of Maimansinh, on condition of the amount being restored to the Jamá the ensuing year. May 20; No. 11.

1406. Letter to Governor-General in Council, requesting decision on the mode to be adopted for restoring reduced revenues in Purniah. June 13; No. 5.

1407. Letter from Governor-General in Council, declining to admit of any remission in the demands against the Rájá of Bardwán,

and desiring that he may be called on for payment of the balance against him; and on failure of payment within ten days, to cause a part of his Zamíndárí to be sold in liquidation. June 11; No. 27.

1408. Report from Collector of Midnapur and Jaleswar Districts, and suggesting measures to be adopted relative to collecting the revenue. May 28; Nos. 17 to 19. Answered June 3.

1409. Collector of Maimansinh reports on the distress of the inhabitants of his District, owing to the unfavourableness of the season, and requests to be allowed to make a temporary remission for some of the small Mahals; and to prevent loss to Government, proposes to make increases on those best able to bear them. June 2; No. 24.

1410. Letter from the Preparer of Reports, enclosing a petition from the Zamíndár of Bishnupur, setting forth the oppression exercised over him by the Díwán appointed to his Zamíndárí by the Collector. June 16; Nos. 29 to 31.

1411. Letter from Secretary to Government, enclosing reports of Collectors as to quantity of grain stored in their Districts. May 28; Nos. 1 to 7.

1412. Letter to Collector of Silhet, authorizing him to distribute small presents among the Khasiá or Hill Rájás, the annual amount not to exceed Sikká Rs. 6000. June 3; No. 9.

1413. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing to the regulation proposed by the Board, that any Landholder refusing to engage for his lands at the Government Jamá shall not be allowed to under-rent them from any Sazáwal. May 27; No. 13.

## JULY, 1788.

1414. Letter to Collector of Dacca, desiring him to attach the collections of the Báhál Nawárá, or lands formerly assigned for the maintenance of war-ships, and to hold the amount in deposit, reporting the purposes to which they are now appropriated. July 8; No. 23.

1415. Letter from Governor-General in Council, authorizing the advance of a sum of Rs. 10,000 to Iswar Chand Rái, to enable him to perform the funeral rites of his deceased father. July 2; No. 1.

1416. Letter to Governor-General in Council, requesting to be furnished

with proceedings which the Court of Directors refer to, relative to the allowance for dispossessed Zamíndárs. July 18; No. 37.

1417. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing the Rájá of Bardwán's proposition for liquidation of his balances, which the Board is authorized to accept. July 16; Nos. 31 and 32.

1418. Collector of Government Customs, Huglí, reports having dispossessed Jagannáth of Sutragarh in consequence of the dissatisfaction of the inhabitants at his behaviour. Ordered to revise the above proceeding. Correspondence regarding the above. October 4, 10, 25; November 6, 7, and 12, 1787; and July 8, 1788.

1419. Letter to Collector of Jessor, desiring him to call on the Zamíndár for a written order (Parwáná) concerning the variations in the Jamá; and should he refuse, to fine him Rs. 1000; and also to inform the Tálukdár of Khulná that if he does not pay more attention to his Táluk, he will be deprived of it in the ensuing year. July 11; No. 16.

1420. Collector of Midnapur submits answers from the Tálukdárs who are desirous of selling their Táluks; the others had provided for the payment of their revenues, except Kirtichandra Mitra, who requested his Táluk might be sold by auction: had ordered the sequestration of lands of an absconded Chaudhrí of Sibpur. July 7; Nos. 13 to 17. Answered July 22.

1421. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, stating that the Board did not deem the enlargement of the Zamíndárs advisable, while any part of the collections remained unrealized, etc. etc. July 21; No. 19.

1422. Collector of Murshidábád is informed that the Board is surprised at his having granted a deduction in the settlement of Wazírábád without sanction. July 18; No. 11.

1423. Collector of Nadiyá reports the death of Rájá Sib Chandra, Zamíndár of the District. June 26; No. 3a.

1424. Collector of Purniah authorized to make Takáví advances, provided the circumstances of the Zamíndárs are such as will not allow them granting this indulgence to the rayats. July 4; No. 13.

1425. Collector of Purniah directed to inform the Zamíndár that if his balance is not paid in five days, part of his Zamíndárí will be sold. July 22; No. 7.

1426. Preparer of Reports ordered to advertise for sale the Parganá

Mandalghát for one month, and then sell it to liquidate the balances due from the Rájá of Bardwán. July 8.

1427. Report from Collector of Rangpur relative to a Permanent Settlement, and on the resources of the District. May 24; No. 22.

## AUGUST, 1788.

1428. Application from Mr. John Bul, requesting that Sub-Treasurer may be directed to receive gold mohars in lieu of silver, on account of a bill due by him. August 25; No. 42.

1429. Petition from Rájá of Bardwán, representing the inconveniences he will suffer from the conditions of the Settlement for 1195. August 5.

1430. Petition from Rájá Baidik Charan Sinh, praying that the Khúd Bandobast of his Zamíndárí of Sarkár Champáran may be concluded with him for 1196, at an increase of Rs. 7000 on the Jamá of previous year. August 22.

1431. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, reporting that, on his distributing the leases (Pattás) to the rayats, the mandals assembled a number of rayats, and excited them to an insurrection, vowing that they would not submit to the Jamábandí. July 30; No. 22.

1432. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, enclosing a petition from the Zamíndár respecting the malpractices of the Mandals, Farmers, etc. August 1; Nos. 23 and 24. Answered August 15, when the Board transmitted him the Governor-General's orders regarding the Bírbhúm rayats.

1433. Letter from Collector of Behar, proposing that the present mode of assessment be altered, as some places were over-assessed, and others quite the reverse, and also submitting his sentiments on the best mode of raising land revenue. January 17; Nos. 42 to 45.

1434. Letter to Collector of Behar, in answer to the above, giving him instructions relative to forming the Settlement for 1196, and informing him that the Settlement commencing with 1197 is to be for ten years. August 19; No. 60.

1435. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting resolution of Governor-General in Council on the various obstacles which conspire to retard judicial inquiries. August 15; No. 4.

1436. Letter from Collector of Dacca, submitting his proceedings regarding the new Settlement of 1195, and stating that many

with proceedings which the Court of Directors refer to, relative to the allowance for dispossessed Zamíndárs. July 18; No. 37.

1417. Letter from Governor-General in Council, enclosing the Rájá of Bardwán's proposition for liquidation of his balances, which the Board is authorized to accept. July 16; Nos. 31 and 32.

1418. Collector of Government Customs, Huglí, reports having dispossessed Jagannáth of Sutragarh in consequence of the dissatisfaction of the inhabitants at his behaviour. Ordered to revise the above proceeding. Correspondence regarding the above. October 4, 10, 25; November 6, 7, and 12, 1787; and July 8, 1788.

1419. Letter to Collector of Jessor, desiring him to call on the Zamíndár for a written order (Parwáná) concerning the variations in the Jamá; and should he refuse, to fine him Rs. 1000; and also to inform the Tálukdár of Khulná that if he does not pay more attention to his Táluk, he will be deprived of it in the ensuing year. July 11; No. 16.

1420. Collector of Midnapur submits answers from the Tálukdárs who are desirous of selling their Táluks; the others had provided for the payment of their revenues, except Kirtichandra Mitra, who requested his Táluk might be sold by auction: had ordered the sequestration of lands of an absconded Chaudhrí of Sibpur. July 7; Nos. 13 to 17. Answered July 22.

1421. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, stating that the Board did not deem the enlargement of the Zamíndárs advisable, while any part of the collections remained unrealized, etc. etc. July 21; No. 19.

1422. Collector of Murshidábád is informed that the Board is surprised at his having granted a deduction in the settlement of Wazírábád without sanction. July 18; No. 11.

1423. Collector of Nadiyá reports the death of Rájá Sib Chandra, Zamíndár of the District. June 26; No. 3a.

1424. Collector of Purniah authorized to make Takáví advances, provided the circumstances of the Zamíndárs are such as will not allow them granting this indulgence to the rayats. July 4; No. 13.

1425. Collector of Purniah directed to inform the Zamíndár that if his balance is not paid in five days, part of his Zamíndárí will be sold. July 22; No. 7.

1426. Preparer of Reports ordered to advertise for sale the Parganá

Mandalghát for one month, and then sell it to liquidate the balances due from the Rájá of Bardwán. July 8.

1427. Report from Collector of Rangpur relative to a Permanent Settlement, and on the resources of the District. May 24; No. 22.

## AUGUST, 1788.

1428. Application from Mr. John Bul, requesting that Sub-Treasurer may be directed to receive gold mohars in lieu of silver, on account of a bill due by him. August 25; No. 42.

1429. Petition from Rájá of Bardwán, representing the inconveniences he will suffer from the conditions of the Settlement for 1195. August 5.

1430. Petition from Rájá Baidik Charan Sinh, praying that the Khúd Bandobast of his Zamíndárí of Sarkár Champáran may be concluded with him for 1196, at an increase of Rs. 7000 on the Jamá of previous year. August 22.

1431. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, reporting that, on his distributing the leases (Pattás) to the rayats, the mandals assembled a number of rayats, and excited them to an insurrection, vowing that they would not submit to the Jamábandí. July 30; No. 22.

1432. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, enclosing a petition from the Zamíndár respecting the malpractices of the Mandals, Farmers, etc. August 1; Nos. 23 and 24. Answered August 15, when the Board transmitted him the Governor-General's orders regarding the Bírbhúm rayats.

1433. Letter from Collector of Behar, proposing that the present mode of assessment be altered, as some places were over-assessed, and others quite the reverse, and also submitting his sentiments on the best mode of raising land revenue. January 17; Nos. 42 to 45.

1434. Letter to Collector of Behar, in answer to the above, giving him instructions relative to forming the Settlement for 1196, and informing him that the Settlement commencing with 1197 is to be for ten years. August 19; No. 60.

1435. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting resolution of Governor-General in Council on the various obstacles which conspire to retard judicial inquiries. August 15; No. 4.

1436. Letter from Collector of Dacca, submitting his proceedings regarding the new Settlement of 1195, and stating that many

of the renters declined engaging for the present year, urging their inability to pay the former assessment (Jamá) on account of the late calamity, and from the great loss of inhabitants by death and desertion owing to the famine. July 15.

1437. Letter to Collector of Dacca in reply, directing the Collector to tender the Settlement of 1195 at the same Jamá as last year, and in case of refusal, to let the lands on the best terms he could, etc. August 12; No. 21.

1438. Letter from Governor-General in Council, confirming the Mukarrarí leases to the Zamíndár of Sultánpur, and stating that the leases sanctioned by the Government are to be submitted for consideration prior to their being cancelled, and leases not originally granted or subsequently confirmed by Government are to be resumed. July 23; No. 1.

1439. Letter from Governor-General in Council, desiring the Board to call on the rayats of Bírbhúm to state their complaints, and if they appeared to be well founded, to refer the matter to the Preparer of Reports. August 8; No. 7.

1440. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing Rájá Rám Krishna to be invested with the Zamíndárí of Rájsháhi, and a demand made upon him for Sikká Rs. 10,000 as a fee of investiture (Peshkásh). August 20; No. 16.

1441. Collector of Midnapur reports his having confiscated the lands of the Zamíndár of Kotalpur. August 1; No. 37.

1442. Letter from Collector of Dacca, reporting that the Nawárá collections are attached, and the purposes for which they are now appropriated, and by whom received. August 23; No. 22.

## SEPTEMBER, 1788.

1443. Letter from Governor-General in Council, giving his decision on debates on the remissions granted in Midnapur, and censures Mr. Mackenzie's intemperate language. September 3; No. 21.

1444. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting that he had caused the Zamíndár of Nárájol to be arrested on account of Midnapur balance. September 6; No. 28. Answered September 30, and Collector directed to keep the lands of the Zamíndár of Nárájol in attachment.

1445. Report from Collector of Tirhut on rent-free lands which have been alienated without authority. August 26; Nos. 44 and 45.

Answered September 16, by transmitting him Government orders on the subject.

OCTOBER, 1788.

1446. Collector of Bírbhúm reports robbery of Treasury by gang-robbers (dákáits), and represents defenceless state of the Treasury for want of a guard. October 17; No. 9.

1447. Collector of Bardwán directed to require payment of Rs. 5000 imposed as a fine upon the Rájá for his disobedience in not furnishing Bází Zamíni Account. October 7; No. 3.

1448. Collector of Bardwán reports having placed the Rájá in confinement in respect of his balances. October 3; No. 11. October 4, Collector reports the balance as having been paid.

1449. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, enclosing an application from several persons to be allowed to sell their lands to pay off their balances. August 20, No. 36a; and September 1, 37 to 53.

1450. Collector of Rangpur reports that Gobind Prasád Mitra is in confinement for non-payment of his balances, and states that unless a remission be granted on forming a new Hastobúd, his Táluk must be sold. September 26; No. 37. Answered October 7; No. 38.

1451. Secretary to Board ordered to transmit extract of letter from Government to Mr. Sherborne, containing his dismissal from the situation of Collector of Bírbhúm, and directing him immediately to make over charge and repair to the Presidency. October 31.

NOVEMBER, 1788.

1452. Rámmohan Dás and Rámballabh Sen petition to be restored to their Zamíndárí of Sultánábád, and offer to pay balances of revenue. November 21; No. 40.

1453. Letter from Collector of Behar, proposing a plan for future assessment of Mukarrarí lands in his District. August 19; No. 14. Answered November 11.

1454. Letter from Collector of Purniah, regarding the misconduct of one Dayárám, a police officer (Thánádár) of Palamang in Mosang, who had seized one of the Company's rayats and beaten him, in consequence of which he died in a few days. October 20; Nos. 13 to 15. Answered November 7, authorizing him to

attach the villages held by Dayárám, and after paying the stipulated revenue to retain the surplus.

## DECEMBER, 1788.

1455. Petition from Lok Nath Nandi, protesting against an increase in the Settlement of 1195. December 27; No. 58.

1456. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting that the Rájá had paid the fine of Rs. 5000 inflicted on him. December 14; No. 15.

1457. Letter from Governor-General in Council, desiring to be informed of the general state of the crops throughout the Provinces, and whether the taking off the embargo on the exportation of grain by sea would be productive of inconvenience to the inhabitants. November 11; No. 6.

1458. Letter to Governor-General in Council in reply. The Board state that, in their opinion, it would not be advisable to take off the embargo immediately. December 2; No. 8.

1459. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing report stating that, owing to the favourable aspect of crops in Dacca, no further importation of grain was necessary. December 4; No. 14.

1460. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, reporting on disturbances in Bangáon. December 15; Nos. 24 to 27.

## JANUARY, 1789.

1461. Petition from Jai Náráyan and others, complaining of being dispossessed of 27 villages in 1192 by the Sundarbans cultivators, for which they have hitherto been unable to obtain any redress. January 13; No. 57.

1462. Circular Letter to Collectors on the state of the grain in their respective Districts. January 27; Nos. 9 to 62.

1463. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing the attachment of land of the Zamíndárs of Sabang, who had refused to obey orders of the Collector, and directing the Collector of Rájsháhi to take means to apprehend ringleaders in the disturbances at Bangáon. December 31.

1464. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting for orders a petition from Rám Prasád and Sio Prasád complaining of undue sales of their lands. January 9; No. 29.

1465. Letter to Governor-General in Council, soliciting early orders regarding the resources of the Midnapur District. January 20.

1466. Letter to Governor-General in Council, regarding the proposals of the Collector of Silang for annexation of Parganás. January 20.

1467. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting a report on the families of the Zamíndárs of Nadiyá, Bírbhúm, and Táherpur. January 20.

1468. Letter to Governor-General in Council, recommending a remission in the assessment (Jamá) of Táluk Jaluká, and that the settlement be concluded. January 20.

1469. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing correspondence with the Collector of Jessor on the subject of a Nirikhbandí. January 20.

1470. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh, enclosing a petition from the Zamíndárs who claim deductions on account of Salt (Khálárí) rents. January 6.

## FEBRUARY, 1789.

1471. Petition from Zamíndár of Sultánábád, praying to be reinstated in his Zamíndárí. February 20; No. 12.

1472. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing proceedings regarding the complaint of the Purniah rayats against the Collector and his Assistant, and submitting the expediency of appointing two Commissioners to inquire into the matter on the spot. February 17; No. 34.

1473. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing one from the Collector of Bírbhúm regarding the depredations of gang-robbers or Dákáits. February 25; No. 44.

1474. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting correspondence regarding the complaint against the Rájá of Bardwán by the Tálukdár of Dwárbásiní, with the Rái Ráyán's report thereon. February 27; No. 18.

1475. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí, informing him that the Zamíndár is to be paid a monthly allowance (Musháhará) at the rate of 5 per cent., half in cash and half in certificates. February 3.

1476. Preparer of Reports directed to issue a notification that Government intend to grant Sanads for the Zamíndarí of Nadiyá to Iswar Chánd, of Bírbhúm to Muhammad Zamán Khán, and of 10 annas Táherpur to Bairu Chánd. February 3.

1477. Letter from Preparer of Reports, enclosing reply of the Collector of Purniah and his Assistant to charges against them. February 10; Nos. 32 and 33.

1478. Report from Rái Ráyán on the rights of the Rájá of Bardwán over the Tálukdárs. February 27; No. 17.

## MARCH, 1789.

1479. Petition from Maniár Sinh, Keher Sinh, etc., requesting leave to dispose of their Zamíndárí in order that they be released from jail. March 13; No. 3.

1480. Petition from Narsinh Deo Rái, Zamíndár of Barídhátí, representing the ruinous situation of his Zamíndárí, and praying for relief. March 17; No. 31.

1481. Petition from widow of Mahárájá Chaitan Sinh, begging for redress against oppressions exercised towards her by Rájá of Bardwán. March 17; No. 45.

1482. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, requesting him to prevent the exportation of grain by sea, and to encourage the export of it to Calcutta. March 17; No. 2.

1483. Circular Letter to Collectors, communicating orders of Council prohibiting their being engaged in commercial transactions. March 6; No. 12.

1484. Report from the Rái Ráyán, on the rights of the Zamíndárs, Tálukdárs, etc. March 13; Nos. 14 to 16.

## APRIL, 1789.

1485. Petition from rayats of Máldah, complaining of oppressive conduct on the part of the Farmer. April 7; No. 39.

1486. Petition from Rám Chandra Sen complaining against the Collector of Nadiyá. April 30; No. 12.

1487. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing correspondence with the Collector of Bírbhúm relative to a dispute between the Zamíndárí Officers of that District, and rayats cultivating lands in it but who reside in other Districts, as to the rates of assessment. April 3; No. 17.

1488. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting him copy of report on a charge of rebellion preferred by the Collector of Silhet against Rádhá Rám. April 7; No. 20.

1489. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing report of Collector of Midnapur of acts of violence committed by the Marhattás on the rayats of Parganá Dántun.

1490. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh on high price of grain, remarking that he is apprehensive rice will be much dearer before the crops are gathered in. April 3; Nos. 45 to 47.

1491. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, representing the unfavourable appearance of the District from want of rain, the scarcity of cattle and want of labouring people, and recommending an advance of Takávi. April 11; No. 21a. Answered April 27, authorizing him to make such advances as may be indispensably necessary.

## MAY, 1789.

1492. Circular Letter to all Collectors, transmitting them a standing order of Council relative to their being vested with authority to proceed against Tálukdárs, etc., paying revenue to Zamíndárs, in the same manner as prescribed by the regulations against defaulting renters paying immediately to Government. May 4; No. 31.

1493. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, submitting application to Commanding Officer at Tánjipur for military aid in consequence of Musá Sháh and his followers having returned to the borders, and threatened to plunder his District. May 13; No. 7.

1494. Letter from Governor-General in Council, desiring that Rádhá Rám may be committed to the Criminal Court at Silhet to take his trial. April 29; No. 30.

1495. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that, for such balances as may be due from the Rájá of Bardwán at the end of Baisákh, a portion of his Zamíndárí be exposed for sale for liquidation thereof. May 4; No. 39.

1496. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting copy of correspondence with the Collector of Bhágalpur on the Settlement of the Rájmahal Districts for 1195, and recommending that the Collector be summoned to Calcutta to answer for his conduct. May 11; No. 49. Answered May 13, directing that the Collector be suspended.

1497. Report from Collector of Murshidábád on petition of Máldah

rayats against Mánik Chánd. April 19; No. 22. Answered May 11.

1498. Letter from Collector of Dacca, transmitting form of Kistbandí for 1196. May 2; Nos. 24 and 25. Answered May 14, No. 26, approving of it.

1499. Letter from Collector of Dacca, transmitting a list of persons in confinement for arrears of revenue. May 12; Nos. 8 and 8a.

1500. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, directing him to inform the Rájá that no abatement will be made from the rent (Jamá) of 1195, and to require from him a specific answer whether he will agree to the same Jamá for 1196 B.S. May 28; No. 35.

1501. Letter to Collector of Dacca, requiring his opinion on Rájá's representation of his distress. May 29; No. 11.

## JUNE, 1789.

1502. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting Rájá's reply on Settlement of 1196 B.S. (2 letters). June 4; Nos. 12, 13, 14, and 15.

1503. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, reporting that a party sent by Captain Hogan to apprehend Bishnu Mánki and Máuji Mánki, who had refused to pay their revenues and had used force, had been repulsed with loss; and also the measures which were taken in consequence. June 13; Nos. 34 to 36.

1504. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting answer of Mr. Adie, Collector of Bhágalpur, to charges preferred against him. June 25; No. 12.

1505. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting reports of Collectors on the prisoners in custody for arrears of revenue. June 29; No. 79.

## JULY, 1789.

1506. Letter from Governor-General in Council giving instructions for removal of Mr. Adair from Collectorship of Bhágalpur. July 10; No. 2.

1507. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing one from Collector of Rámgarh relative to an insurrection in Tomár. July 20.

1508. Minutes of Mr. John Mackenzie on official conduct of the Acting

President and the Secretary to the Board. July 6; No. 33. July 6; No. 40. July 13; No. 65. July 14; No. 33.

1509. Letter to Collector of Maimansinh, transmitting him letters of the Council and of Mr. Eliot regarding the Sanyásís. July 16.

1510. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, informing of success of Lieutenant Cooper's expedition against insurgents in Tomár. July 18; No. 44.

1511. Secretary to Board, replying to Mr. Mackenzie's animadversion on his official conduct. July 8; No. 1. July 10; No. 63. July 14; No. 31.

1512. Mr. Graham's (Acting President of the Board) reply to Mr. Mackenzie's Minute respecting his official conduct. July 13; No. 62.

## AUGUST, 1789.

1513. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, authorizing a Takáví advance of Rs. 2500 to rayats of Colgong. August 13.

1514. Letter from Collector of Dacca, regarding depredations of Jugol Kisor, the Zamíndár of Maimansinh, in Tappá Singdá. July 1; Nos. 39 to 41. Answered August 18, conveying Government orders on the subject.

1515. Collector of Sháhábád submits questions relative to a Permanent Settlement. June 6; No. 12.

1516. Minute of Mr. J. Shore, President, accompanied by petition from Rájá of Bardwán proposing current year's Settlement. August 3; Nos. 1 and 2.

1517. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, remarking on resolutions of Council regarding a Permanent Settlement. June 16.

## SEPTEMBER, 1789.

1518. Letter to Assistant Collector of Tipperah, conveying instructions relative to regulation of rents payable by the rayats. September 7.

1519. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, regarding monthly allowance (Musháhará) ordered to the dispossessed Zamíndár. September 21; No. 28a.

## OCTOBER, 1789.

1520. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, transmitting petition of

Muhammad Asgar, Zamíndár of 4.1.3. Sandwíp, tendering a sum on account of his balance of 1195, and praying that his lands might not be sold. September 25; Nos. 31 and 32. Answered October 5.

1521. Letter from Governor-General in Council, authorizing Collector of Bírbhúm to release persons confined for balances of 1194, and requesting the Board to ascertain from the other Collectors whether any persons confined at the suit of Government are in like circumstances. September 25; No. 8.

1522. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting letters from the Collector of Silhet on deficiencies in consequence of depredations by the Khásiás, and recommending the amount to be written off. October 5; No. 25. Agreed to, October 5.

1523. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting proceedings on complaints of Zamíndárs of Sandwíp. October 12; No. 32.

1524. Letter to Governor-General in Council, forwarding answers of Collectors to a reference made to them respecting the present distribution of Collectorships, and a letter from the Secretary to the Board on the same subject. October 29; No. 66.

1525. Letter to Collector of Purniah, transmitting copy of letter from Sub-Secretary to Government regarding disturbances on the Nepál Frontier. October 26.

## NOVEMBER, 1789.

1526. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, enclosing him instructions from Government for Settlement of his District for ten years. November 30.

1527. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur on oppressive taxes levied on the weavers. October 28; No. 7.

## DECEMBER, 1789.

1528. Circular Letter to Collectors, requiring a statement of all lands in their several Districts, whether Zamíndárís or Táluks, paying revenue to other Collectors. December 17.

1529. Circular Letter, informing of resignation of Mr. Shore as President of the Board, and of the appointment of the Hon. C. Stuart in his place. December 24.

1530. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the con-

duct of the Collector of Rangpur in despatching troops to the assistance of the Resident at Goálpárá; enclosing letters received from Mr. Baillie on the subject, and directing that the lands of the Zamíndár of Mahespárá be confiscated and a reward offered for his apprehension. December 9; Nos. 3 to 5.

## JANUARY, 1790.

1531. Petition from Gaur Hari Rái, petitioning against the Collector of Silhet for appointing Kánúngos to measure his land, contrary to the Sanad granted. January 7; No. 3.

1532. Petition from Gowál Dás and others, merchants of Patna, respecting undue exaction of duties. January 7; Nos. 27 and 28.

1533. Attorney of the Company transmits copy of a letter from the Collector of Calcutta respecting a person who declined to pay the fee required from natives on granting leases (Pattás), alleging that he is a British subject from being born at Bombay. Requests the question will be referred to the Advocate-General. January 4.

1534. Letter from Attorney, forwarding Advocate-General's opinion on the above subject. January 18; No. 17.

1535. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, relative to liquidating the last year's balance of Bishnupur from the profits of Chaitan Sinh's share of Batarját. October 15; Nos. 30 and 31.

1536. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, relative to the resumption of the Senápati Mahals, and the Mahal Berá in Bishnupur. October 17; Nos. 32 and 33.

1537. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, requesting orders respecting nineteen villages in Bishnupur claimed as Darpatní by Doman Sinh Thákur. November 8; Nos. 34 and 35.

1538. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, in reply to the three foregoing letters: requires a report on balance due from Chaitan Sinh, and the sum anticipated by him of current year's resources; an account of the collections made from the lands claimed by Nimái Sinh; and to report to the Board on the Berá and Senápatí Mahal collections. January 4; No. 36.

1539. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, informing him that Muhammad Zamán Khán is to be invested with the Zamíndárí of Bírbhúm, and an investiture fee (Peshkásh) demanded from him on the amount of the assessment (Jamá). January 14.

1540. Letter from Collector of Behar, in reply to the petition of the merchants of Patna, referred to him for report, encloses his correspondence with Salt Comptroller on a complaint of the salt merchants. January 17; Nos. 26, 27, and 27a.

1541. Collector of Bhágalpur reports on the rate at which Sonát Rupees are collected from the rayats, and transmits copies of report of Zamíndárs on rates of exchange (Báttá) in their Parganás. November 26; Nos. 33, 34, 35, and 36.

1542. Collector of Bardwán directed to enforce the order for obliging non-resident cultivators (Paíkásht rayats) of Bírbhúm to pay their balances. January 21; No. 8.

1543. Letter from Collector of Dacca, enclosing a petition from Gumáshtás of the Zamíndárs of Rájnagar, requesting that a person might be ordered to realize the revenues, and stating that he had complied with the application. October 20; Nos. 36 and 37.

1544. Letter to Collector of Dacca, in reply to the above, approving of his having complied with the application of the Gumáshtá, concluding he had previously adjusted the accounts between him and the renter. Same date; No. 38.

1545. Letter from Collector of Dacca, enclosing report of the Officer sent to investigate the mutual complaints of Resident at Lakshmípur and the Zamíndár of Dákshin Shábázpur, and recommending that the tax on weavers called Tánt Salámí be abolished. December 24; 43 and 44.

1546. Collector of Dinájpur reporting on the measures taken by him to preserve the property of the minor Zamíndárs of Parganá Sálbárís and Taraf Paugáchhá, and recommending the depositing of the surplus income of their estates in the Treasury. January 13; No. 25.

1547. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, in reply to above, directing the Collector to call on the Gumáshtás to give an account; to apply the unappropriated balance towards the improvement of the estate, and should any balance still remain, to remit it to the Board to be invested in Government Securities. January 28; No. 26.

1548. Collector of Dacca authorized to advance Takávi to certain Mahals; but to ascertain, previous to doing so, that the Zamíndárs are unable to make the same themselves. January 25; No. 11.

549. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting information from the Collector of Maimansinh of a body of Sanyásís having entered the District. January 18; No. 19.

550. Collector of Jessor authorized to make a Takávi advance to the rayats, to the extent of three per cent. on the rent (Jamá). January 21.

1551. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, agreeing to suspension of Paush instalment to rayats of inundated Parganás, to call on the renters to grant an adequate suspension of their demands on the suffering rayats, and to report when executed, and to transmit a detailed account of sums suspended. January 18; No. 39.

1552. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh, directing him to conclude settlements with the Rájás of Rámgarh, Palámau, and Kindi (?), according to previous instructions. January 14; No. 4.

1553. Acting Secretary to Board of Revenue requested to prepare an advertisement for taking off restriction in trade in salt between Bengal and Assam. January 11.

1554. Letter from Sub-Secretary to Government, directing that the Residentship of Goálpárá be abolished at the end of the current year, the Districts to be annexed to the Collectorships from which they were separated, or to any other Collectorship the Board may judge proper: to publish in the Gazette that the restriction imposed on salt between Bengal and Assam is to cease, and that the trade in salt and other articles is open to all persons not prohibited from trading. January 6; No. 6.

1555. Letter from Collector of Silhet, recommending sale of the Parganás destroyed by the Khasiás, in preference to making them over to Sazáwals. December 29; No. 28. Answered January 14, directing him to summon the proprietors of lands destroyed by the Khasiás, and to ascertain from them, if Takávi be advanced, whether they will agree to pay a Jamá. January 14; No. 29.

1556. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, enclosing report of Kánúngos of Sarishá relative to claims of Sayyid Muhammad Mashím on Mauzá Sikandarpur. December 4; Nos. 19 and 20.

1557. Collector of Bhágalpur reports his proceedings on Settlement of Parganá Bhágalpur, and transmits a comparative statement between Settlements of 1196 and 1197. December 15; No. 46.

1558. Secretary to Government informs that a sentence of perpetual

imprisonment and banishment has been passed on Muhammad Haiát for gang robbery (Dákáití) and murder, and that his property has been ordered to be confiscated and sold. January 20; No. 7.

1559. Letter from Sub-Secretary to Government, transmitting correspondence between the Commander at Bákarganj and Collector of Dacca, relative to a tax called Damdárí Mahal, and stating that orders are to be at once issued for abolishing the same. January 20; Nos. 16 and 17.

## FEBRUARY, 1790.

1560. Letter to Accountant to Board of Revenue, informing him that the rents from the Paltáhát lands from 1191 to 1196 B.S., payable to the Board, are to be written off as irrecoverable. February 4.

1561. Letter from Accountant to the Board, enclosing statement of receipts of Zamíndár of Jahángírpur for allowance (Musháhará). February 1; Nos. 36 and 37.

1562. Letter from Accountant to the Board, transmitting reply of Rájá of Bardwán's Vakíl, relative to a demand of Rs. 16,645 due on account of deficiency of remittances, and an over-payment of monthly allowance on account of 1193 B.S., stating he had paid the whole of that year's revenue to Mr. Kinloch, and referring to that gentleman's accounts in support of his statements. February 10; Nos. 24, 25, and 26.

1563. Petition from rayats of Mágurá in 24 Parganás, praying that Mr. Camac may be directed to investigate into their losses from inundations, etc. February 11; No. 44.

1564. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, requesting to be allowed a military force to get in the collections from the Senápati and Berá Mahals, and on account of gang of robbers (dakáits) assembled in his neighbourhood. February 4; Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4. Answered February 8, in which the Board authorized him to send a detachment for the purpose requested.

1565. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, informing that, as the Tálukdárs of Sháhjurá had fallen in balance, the Board's regulations had been enforced against them, and a Sazáwal appointed. December 9; Nos. 26 and 27. Answered February 11, No. 28, approving of the above measures.

1566. Letter from Collector of Behar, submitting a representation of the Ghyáspur Tahsíldár, relative to proprietors of villages who refuse to engage themselves, together with his sentiments on the subject, and requests orders upon the ninth article of the resolution respecting minors and females. January 27; Nos. 17 and 18. Answered February 18, No. 19, giving instructions and orders on the above subject.

1567. Order (Parwáná) to Rájá of Bardwán (through the Collector), directing him to advance the necessary sums for repair of the embankments. February 1.

1568. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, enclosing a petition from the Rájá, representing that the Farmer of Báliá and Chandrakoná has absconded to Serampur, leaving balances due of Rs. 60,000, and begging that measures may be taken to have the man delivered up. February 2; Nos. 36 and 37.

1569. Letter to Collector of Calcutta, authorizing him to deliver Jarib Pattás to the present proprietors, free of expense. February 9; Nos. 38 and 39.

1570. Circular Letter to Collectors of Bengal, forwarding them copy of resolution of Government for the ten years' Settlement of Bengal. February 18.

1571. Letter from Acting Collector of Dacca, transmitting a petition from Pran Charan Bánarji, a Náib of the late proprietor of 5.15 Salímábád, begging to be released from confinement. January 23; Nos. 29 and 30. Answered January 31, desiring him to call on the petitioner to prove the circumstances stated by him in his letter.

1572. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, representing the contumacious conduct of the Rání, in confining the Rájá, etc., and recommending her removal to a house sixteen miles from Dinájpur. January 29; 12 and 13. Answered February 4, No. 14, informing him of having submitted his letter to the Council for orders.

1573. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, with reference to the above, directing him to remove the Rání from her present habitation to Govindnagar, after giving her fifteen days' previous notice. February 15; No. 6.

1574. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the orders of the Board to Collector of Dacca relative to Takávi, and approving the orders for the Mahals composing the Sáyer

Karaibárí Collectorship to be placed under the Commissioner of Kuch Behar. February 3; No. 6.

1575. Letter from Governor-General in Council, observing with much satisfaction from Mr. Evelyn's report, that the charges preferred by the rayats of Purniah against the Collector and his Assistant appear to be without foundation. February 3; No. 1.

1576. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Silhet, requesting a revocation of orders for sale of estate of Landholders (Chaudhrís) of Dinárpur, which the Board recommend compliance with. February 11; No. 43.

1577. Letter from Governor-General in Council, authorizing the revocation of the sale of the lands of the Chaudhrís of Dinárpur, and also the abolition of the tax levied on the musicians (Bájantarí Mahal tax) in Rájsháhi and Murshidábád. February 19; No. 1.

1578. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, reporting that he has taken measures to enforce payment of balances due from the Bírbhúm non-resident (Páikásht) rayats in his District. February 5; No. 4.

1579. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, authorizing him to pay the monthly allowance (Musháhará) due to Bishnurám to the end of 1192. February 15.

1580. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, directing him to abolish the tax on musicians (Bájántarí Mahal), and to report the remission in the current year's Settlement to which the Farmer will be entitled. February.—Answered February 18, reporting on the claims of the Farmer of Bájantarí Mahal.

1581. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, enclosing a petition from Hari Prasád Rái, Zamíndár of Muhammadámínpur, requesting permission to mortgage lands to pay his balance. January 22; Nos. 27 and 28. Answered February 1, No. 28a, conveying sanction to the above.

1582. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, stating that the Collector has repaid with interest the sum advanced as Takáví. February 15; Nos. 22 and 23.

1583. Letter to Preparer of Reports, transmitting him copy of a publication received from the Collector of Bardwán, requiring the purchasers of Mandalghát to pay their balances, on penalty of having their lands sold. February 15.

1584. Letter to Collector of Silhet, in reply to one of his, dated January

Police in possession of the different spots of ground formerly appropriated to the purpose of stations (Thánás) for the Sidwáls (Sazáwals?). March 1.

1594. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, transmitting a petition from Shaikh Abdul Majíd, stating his inability to pay his revenue on account of the encroachment of the sea on his land, and praying that an Amín be deputed to ascertain the same. February 20; Nos. 5 and 6. Answered March 11, No. 6a, requiring the Collector to report on the necessity of the investigation asked for.

1595. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing a petition of the Farmer of Sandwíp for recovery of balances due from Tálukdárs in Calcutta. March 16; Nos. 31 and 32. Answered March 25, No. 33, informing him that the Tálukdárs have been sent back, and directing him, in all instances of balances, to proceed according to the regulations.

1596. Circular Letter to Collectors, directing them to issue a public notification of the discontinuance of the Amalnámá (authority for taking possession) fee, and also to ascertain in every Parganá whether this fee has become an additional assessment on the rayats. March 25; No. 36.

1597. Circular Letters to Collectors of Behar, transmitting them extracts from the Board's letter to the Council of 22d October last, and of reply received thereto, relative to the Settlement. March 11.

1598. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing him to issue Sabai Chatwán (?) Rupees to the Residents at Dacca and Lakshmípur, and to receive Gutua and other improper coins, and remit them to the Presidency to be recoined. March 4.

1599. Letter to Collector of Dacca, authorizing him to depute an assistant to inquire into the complaint of the Zamíndárs of Salímábád against the Tálukdárs of Jessor. February 24, No. 49; and March 4, No. 50.

1600. Letter from Collector of Dacca, enclosing petition from the Chaudhrís of 2.7.2 and 4½ Salímábád, relative to an embezzlement of Government Revenue by Rádhá Krishna Chánd, Sazáwal of Jabbar Amal. February 6; Nos. 33 and 34. Answered March 18, directing him to sell the lands of Rádhá Krishna Chánd, in liquidation of the amount he defrauded Government.

1601. Letter to Collector of Dacca, authorizing his proposed sale of lands in liquidation of balances of 1194 and 1195. March 25.

had not been admitted, and the Board desired the Collector again to demand payment of the amount. March 4; No. 24. Answered on March 8; in which the Collector is directed to inform the Rájá that Mr. Eliot is allowed interest on the amount due on account of his expenses to Nischintpur from September 5, 1786, and directing him to attach the Rájá's lands in case he should refuse immediately to pay the whole.

1610. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, transmitting a letter from Mr. Camac respecting crops destroyed by the inundation. Requests indulgence for the rayats of Parganá Máidanmal, which was not included in the reference made to him, and proposing to return into the inundated Parganás to make known the suspensions allowed. February 23; Nos. 21 to 31.

1611. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, transmitting him a resolution of Council relative to remissions to be granted to the rayats as recommended by his Assistant, who is to be deputed to make the same; and directing him to furnish information respecting the amount realizable by the renters.

1612. Letter to Collector of Purniah, transmitting him Account Sales of the Zamíndárí of Dharmpur, with directions that should any part of the balance remain, to call upon the Zamíndár to discharge the residue, informing him that if he does not do so immediately, a further portion of his land will be sold to make it good. March 18.

1613. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, enclosing a petition from the Náíb Díwán of Jhálidá, reporting on the depredations committed in Jhálidá, and stating that he had applied to the Commanding Officer at Hazáríbágh for a company of Sepoys. February. Date not given.

1614. Letter from the Collector of Rángámáti, informing the Board of the demise of Rámrám, the refractory Zamíndár, and of having received a letter from his mother, imploring the mercy of Government. February 14; No. 13. Answered March 1; stating that the subject must be decided on by Government.

1615. Report on the petition of the Zamíndárs of Midnapur by the Preparer of Reports. January 22; No. 14.

1616. Letter from Preparer of Reports, enclosing correspondence with Collector of Bírbhúm, regarding complaints of certain rayats of exaction on their rent-free lands. March 23; Nos. 48 and 49.

1617. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, directing him to proceed against

the persons who have been found guilty of exactions on the thread (Sutanali) merchants. March 4; No. 54.

1618. Rái Ráyán directed to call on the Sadr Kánúngos for their opinion, and to ascertain whether, according to the custom of the country, escheats within the limits of Huzúrí Táluks fall to the Tálukdár or to the Government. March 25.

1619. Letter from Collector of Silhet, enclosing proposals for the assessment (Jamá) of the Parganás destroyed by the Khasiás, and requesting orders as to the settlement, etc. March 16; Nos. 74 and 75.

1620. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, directing him not to grant any indulgences to the Zamíndárs, who are to pay the Revenue at the stated periods. March 25; No. 58.

## APRIL, 1790.

1621. Petition from Gumáshtá of the Chaudhrís of Kásipur, requesting to be reinstated in a Táluk which he states to have been unjustly decreed to the Zamíndár of Noábád. April 1; No. 54.

1622. Petition from Rámkrishna Basu, son of the late Zamíndár of Baikunthpur, complaining of being deprived of his Zamíndárí by false representations, etc., and begging redress. No date.

1623. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, transmitting answer of the Zamíndárs of Bírbhúm and Bishnupur relative to the proposed settlement for ten years, with his sentiments thereon. April 5; Nos. 25 to 27.

1624. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, respecting balances due by the Zamíndár, and giving his reasons for not enforcing the payment thereof. April 3; No. 88.

1625. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, requiring his Regulation for the collection of the duties at Deoghar, with particular information of the mode in which these collections have been made. April 19; No. 40.

1626. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, respecting the opposition of the landholders in the Berá and Senápati Mahals in Bishnupur, furnishing his proposition thereon, and also an account giving particulars of lands held under the Berá and Senápati Mahals. April 14; Nos. 55 to 58. Replied, April 19, No. 59, approving the Collector's proposition for summoning the landholders who

have opposed Mr. Hesilrige's investigations, to answer for their conduct.

1627. Minute by Mr. Charles Chapman, conveying his sentiments on Mr. Law's proposition relative to the future assessment of Tálukdárs, assenting to Mr. Graham's proposition thereon. April 15; No. 47.

1628. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, recommending the investigation asked for by Shaikh Abdul Majíd. March 24; No. 22. Answered, April 8, No. 23, agreeing to the investigation on the Zamíndár's engaging to bear all the expenses attending it, and requiring the Collector to report the result.

1629. Circular Letter to Bengal Collectors, informing them of an additional clause to the orders for Settlement, respecting landholders who may be unable to make good arrears due from them. April 8.

1630. Letter to Mr. Wm. Cowper, Acting President, directing him to summon the Zamíndárs of Mulki and Balia, now in Calcutta, and ascertain what objection they have to return to their Zamíndárís. April 1.

1631. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing him to order his Assistant to repair immediately to the Rájnagar Zamíndárí, to make the partition (Batwárá). April 1; No. 40.

1632. Minute from Mr. W. Cowper, replying to Mr. Law's on the 1st inst. relative to future assessment of Tálukdárs. April 5; No. 71.

1633. Minute from Mr. W. Cowper, concurring in the sentiments expressed by Mr. Graham in his minute of the 8th inst. on the rights of Tálukdárs, and objecting to the proposition of Mr. Law. April 15; No. 46.

1634. Letter to Mr. W. Cowper, requesting him to send Kási Náth Chaudhrí under custody to the Collector of Dacca, unless he discharges the balances due from him. April 8.

1635. Letter from Mr. W. Cowper, laying before the Board extract of letter from Collector of Sháhábád in answer to a petition of Saráj-ud-dín referred to him from the Khálsá, and suggesting the propriety of directing the abolition of the fees (Rusúm) mentioned in the Collector's letter. April 19; Nos. 41 and 43.

1636. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing to proposals respecting Mahals in Silhet destroyed by the Khasiás. March 31; No. 3.

1637. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting questions on the Settlement with the Zamíndár of Báhirbánd. April 5; No. 15.

1638. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Midnapur relative to Bansingiri Marhattá, directed to be detained in custody till further orders. April 5; No. 40.

1639. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting reports on the measurement of lands attached to the Lakshmípur Factory, with the Board's opinion on the proposals for farming the same; also submitting proceedings on the claim of the Zamíndárs of Sháistánagar to Char Etbangá, etc. April 5; No. 63.

1640. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing that the clause in the orders for Behar settlement respecting landholders unable to make good their arrears, do form an additional rule for Bengal also. April 7; No. 1.

1641. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting representation from the Postmaster-General, of the mails being impeded by the Zamíndárs, and the action taken by the Board in consequence. April 15; No. 32.

1642. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting extracts of proceedings, containing remarks and propositions relative to the future assessment of the Tálukdárs. April 15; No. 48.

1643. Letter to Governor-General in Council, requesting instructions respecting the provision for the Zamíndárs of Nadiyá in forming the Decennial Settlement, and also submitting letter from the Collector respecting Bátí Salámí, and recommending that these collections be abolished. April 19; No. 16.

1644. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the measures taken by the Collector of Rámgarh in consequence of the depredations committed by Bekár Sinh, and approving the Board's proceedings respecting Rájnagar and Bhuluá. April 21; No. 3.

1645. Letter from Governor-General in Council, authorizing the abolition of the collections from the holders of charitable lands (Aímádárs) mentioned in the letter from the Collector of Sháhábád. April 21; No. 4.

1646. Letter to Governor-General in Council, informing of the Board having appointed Messrs. Paterson and Spottiswood to proceed in concert with the Dutch deputies to settle an exchange for the village of Baránagar. April 22; No. 20.

1647. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting an extract of proceedings on the annual charge for illuminating the Husaini Dalán at Dacca; recommending that the charge be allowed for the past time, but that it be discontinued in future. April 22; No. 43.

1648. Minute by Mr. T. Graham, containing proposition respecting the future assessment of the Tálukdárs. April 8; No. 30.

1649. Minutes by Mr. T. Law, conveying his sentiments on the articles of the Bengal Regulations for the Decennial Settlement, relative to assessment of Tálukdárs. April 1, No. 44, and April 8, No. 31.

1650. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting on the petition of Muhammad Manír, and others, Jágírdárs, relative to the resumption of the Jágírs. February 6; No. 50. Answered, April 19, No. 52, directing him to suspend any further demand of the Jágírdárs, and to cause what has been taken from them to be refunded.

1651. Letter to Collector of Maimansinh, transmitting him copy of a petition from the Tálukdárs of Atiá, complaining of the Zamíndár for anticipating the revenue, with directions to prevent the same. April 8.

1652. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, on the measures taken by him to realize the balances due from Bírbhúm non-resident cultivators (Páikásht rayats) residing in his District. March 27; Nos. 27 to 30.

1653. Letter to Collector of Purniah, transmitting him for report a petition from the Zamíndár of Súrjyapur, complaining that his lands are attached through the collusion of the Díwán. April 19; No. 47.

1654. Letter to Collector of Purniah, transmitting him the petition of the widow of Dharnáth Já, complaining of being dispossessed of her lands, and desiring to report immediately on the subject. April 19; No. 49.

1655. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, and enclosures, informing the Board of measures taken by him to procure payment of balances due from the Bírbhúm non-resident (Paikásht) rayats residing in his District. March 23; Nos. 24 to 26.

1656. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, transmitting answer of the Zamíndár on the Decennial Settlement, with his own sentiments thereon. April 8; Nos. 30 to 32.

1657. Collector of Rámgarh reports of further depredations committed by Bekár Sinh in Bujmári, and of his having offered a reward for his arrest. April 3; No. 9. Answered, April 23, approving of the measures taken.

1658. Letter to Preparer of Reports, transmitting him petition from Nandkumár Rái, etc., claiming part of Mágurá and Kháspur in the 24 Parganás, with directions to call on the petitioners to prove their descent from the dispossessed Zamíndárs. April 5.

1659. Report from Rái Ráyán on the custom of the country with respect to allowances made to dispossessed Tálukdárs. April 1; No. 53.

1660. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, transmitting him for report a petition from the Agent of the Rájá of Nepál respecting disputed lands on the banks of the river Bághmatí. April 22.

Petition from Zamíndár of Baikunthpur, complaining of depredations committed by the Bhutiás. April 22.

1661. Letter from Collector of Dacca, representing the inability of sundry Mahals to pay the ten years' rent (Jamá) required; and will shortly transmit remarks on such of the petty Mahals as are incapable of bearing the assessment. April 29; No. 6.

1662. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, submitting further information required relative to the demands on non-resident (Páikásht) rayats. April 15; Nos. 43 to 49.

1663. Letter to Collector of Tirhut, approving of the amount of assessment (Jamá) for the Decennial Settlement; requiring him to report his proceedings respecting the exclusion of the proprietors (Máliks), particularly the case of Rájá Madhu Sinh, and to report on circumstances where proprietors decline to enter into engagements owing to objections to the amount of assessment (Jamá). April 29; No. 8.

1664. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, reporting on the petition of the rayats of Barídhátí and Háthiágarh, that he considered them deserving of the same indulgence as the rayats of other inundated Parganás. April 8; No. 36.

## MAY, 1790.

1665. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, enclosing answer from the Zamíndár agreeing to the assessment (Jamá) proposed for the Decennial Settlement. April 28; Nos. 52 and 53.

1666. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, conveying instructions relative to the balances due from the non-resident (Páíkásht) rayats. May 10.

1667. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, enclosing a notification issued on the Decennial Settlement of Rájmahal. May 12; No. 16.

1668. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting representation from the Zamíndár on the New Settlement, with his own remarks thereon; also his claim to deductions in Mandalghát, etc. April 25; Nos. 35 to 38.

1669. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, enclosing a representation from the Rájá on the Decennial Settlement; his remarks on the assessment, and his sentiments on the remission in the assessment (Jamá) required by the Rájá. April 28; Nos. 39 to 41.

1670. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, enclosing a representation from the Rájá requesting three months' time for the payment of his Chaitra balances; and a statement of balances due from the Farmers to the Rájá. April 28; Nos. 42 to 44.

1671. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, stating that the Board cannot grant any abatement to the Rájá on account of the sale of Mandalghát; nor can they allow any deduction of Jamá on the plea urged with regard to the marochá or marriage tax collections; nor did they conceive that the Zamíndár was entitled to any remission on account of money paid for the robbery of Manirámpur, and desiring the Collector to enforce payment of the balance due. The Board could not either agree to the temporary abatement required, and desired the Collector to submit a statement of lands for sale in liquidation of outstanding balances. May 3; No. 46.

1672. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, stating that he has issued publication for sale of a part of Parganá Mandalghát. April 26; Nos. 47 and 48.

1673. Minute by Mr. Charles Chapman on the proposition of Mr. Law for altering rights on rent-free lands (Bází Zamín). May 8.

1674. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, authorizing an investigation into the assets of Taraf Alhyár Khán (who states his inability to pay permanent rent (Jamá), on account of the encroachment of the sea on his land), upon the Zamíndár stipulating to bear all expenses thereof. May 7; No. 19.

1675. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, representing that the settle-

ment is impeded by the absence of the Zamíndárs in Calcutta, who left the Province in defiance of his authority. April 22; No. 36. Answered, May 13, directing him to issue a public notification requiring the absent landholders to appear within a month, etc. May 13; No. 37.

1676. Circular Letter to Bengal Collectors, furnishing them with resolution of Council relative to Tálukdárs. May 14.

1677. Circular Letter to all Collectors, directing them not to correspond on public affairs with any person at Chandernagar. May 17.

1678. Circular Letter to Bengal Collectors, transmitting them copy of rule laid down in orders for the Behar Decennial Settlement for their guidance. May 21.

1679. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them an extract of letter from Council, with the questions therein referred to, for their guidance in executing the orders relative to Tálukdárs. April 24; Nos. 2 and 3.

1680. Letter from Mr. W. Cowper, Acting President, stating that he is against Mr. Law's proposition regarding the rent-free lands (Bazí Zamín) Regulations. May 14.

1681. Letter to Collector of Dacca, authorizing a deduction of Rs. 20,000 from the assessment (Jamá) of Rájnagar for the current year, and an abatement of Rs. 7000 in the Jamá of Jalálpur for 1196, recoverable at the end of three years. May 10.

1682. Letter to Governor-General in Council, forwarding letters and enclosures from the Collector of Jessor, submitting a statement relative to the cultivation of the Sundarbans, and suggesting the expediency of relinquishing the idea of cultivating them, and discontinuing the monthly allowance. May 3; No. 23.

1683. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the means taken for effecting an adjustment of the claims of the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm on the non-resident (Páikásht) rayats. May 7; No. 6.

1684. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing to sale of portion of lands of Mandalghát, and also of the Zamíndárí of Bardwán for the discharge of arrears. May 7; No. 8.

1685. Letter to Governor-General in Council, recommending that a sum of Rs. 1000, received by persons under Mr. Camac for the purpose of corrupting him, be given to the Committee for relief of debtors. May 10; No. 12. Answered, May 13, No. 38, agreeing to the above proposition.

1686. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a list of prisoners in the several Collectorships for demands of revenue on 31st March 1790, with explanation from the Secretary on no lists being sent for January and February. May 14; No. 51.

1687. Minute by Mr. T. Graham, stating that he is against Mr. Law's propositions for altering the rent-free lands (Bazí Zamín) Regulations. May 19.

1688. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, recommending the sale of Parganá Barajit on account of the refractoriness of the Zamíndár and his withholding a balance. April 21; No. 41.

1689. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, stating that he has confiscated Parganá Chitua, the property of Lakshmí Náráyan, in consequence of his contumacy. May 7; No. 29. Answered, May 13, No. 30, requiring particulars of the disobedience of the Zamíndár.

1690. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, informing him of orders having been issued for the sale of Parganá Barajit. May 1; Nos. 34 and 35.

1691. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, with instructions for the adjustment of balances due from the non-resident (Páikásht) rayats. May 10.

1692. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, requiring report on the usage of Parganá Rájpur, as to whether a Táluk held for several years at a fixed rent (Jamá) is considered to establish a prescriptive right to its being held at the same Jamá in future. May 7; No. 4.

1693. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, submitting a representation from the Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs of his District on the Decennial Settlement, with his sentiments thereon. April 30; Nos. 19 and 20.

1694. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, desiring him to attend the Board with such part of his records as relate to the inability of his District to bear the present assessment, etc. May 6; No. 21.

1695. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, authorizing the proprietors (Chaudhrís) of Karjihát to borrow money to pay the balance of this year's revenue. May 6; No. 33.

1696. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, informing him of sale to be made of a portion of the Rájá's lands for liquidation of his balances, etc. May 10.

1697. Preparer of Reports directed to advertise for the sale of Parganás

Azmatsháhí and Muzaffarsháhí, for discharge of balances due from Zamíndár of Bardwán. May 13.

1698. Letter from Collector of Purniah, reporting on the petition of Dhirauti, widow of Dhírnáth, complaining of having been dispossessed of a quantity of Brahmottar land. May 4; No. 27.

1699. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, directing him to call on Rájá Madhu Sinh to engage for the rent (Jamá) fixed; to furnish proceedings on the exclusion of any landholder from the ensuing settlement, leaving him at liberty to postpone settlement with petty landholders. May 21; No. 15.

1700. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, reporting on the petition of Rájá Madhu Sinh. May 15; No. 16.

1701. Letter to Governor-General in Council, informing of the Board having fined the Collector of Maimansinh Rs. 1000 for not furnishing the annual Price Current. May 31; No. 12.

1702. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, stating that in consequence of the contumacious conduct of the Zamíndár of Chituá, he had sequestered his lands. He is reported to have been connected in the robberies in the District. May 18; Nos. 3 and 4.

## JUNE, 1790.

1703. Letter to Collector of Behar, informing him of orders for the sale of lands of Kumár Rámnaráyan, and Mukarrarí villages of Bahádur Sinh, in discharge of balances. June 4.

1704. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, informing that the Rájá had paid the whole of his balances for 1196. June 21; No. 4.

1705. Letter from Mr. Charles Chapman, remarking on Mr. Graham's minute relative to Tálukdárs. June 9; No. 24.

1706. Minute from Mr. C. Chapman, conveying his sentiments on right of the Zamíndárs to dispose of Malguzárí lands. June 9; No. 28.

1707. Circular Letter to the Collectors, informing them that the Board is constituted a Court of Review as well as of Appeal, and directing them to correspond separately on all matters of a judicial nature, and to transmit on the 1st of each month an abstract register of all causes heard by them as Collectors. June 2.

1708. Circular Letters to Collectors, directing them to notify that all lands the immediate property of the Company are to be dis-

posed of, and to transmit, at the expiration of the period of publication, a report of claims, and statement of such lands; in the meantime, all lands of that description are to be held kh*á*s. June 2; No. 17.

1709. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing to the expediency of disposing of the Khás Mahals in the 24 Parganás, and the other Districts, which are the immediate property of the Company. June 2; No. 16.

1710. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a list of prisoners confined on account of not paying their revenues up to end of April. June 2; No. 29.

1711. Letter from Governor-General in Council, conveying instructions for the assessment of Táluks. May 28; No. 31.

1712. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Calcutta on the oppressions exercised by the Sidwáls (*sic*) at the Gháts, and at the avenues of the town. June 16; No. 15.

1713. Minute by Mr. T. Graham, with his remarks on the minutes of Messrs. Law and Chapman respecting the separation of the Tálukdárs. June 9, No. 23, and June 9, No. 26.

1714. Minute by Mr. T. Law, conveying his sentiments on a proposition of the Acting President's relative to the late orders respecting Tálukdárs. June 7; No. 2.

1715. Minute by Mr. Law, in answer to Mr. Graham. June 9; Nos. 25 and 27.

1716. Minute by Mr. Law, conveying his sentiments on the right of the Zamíndárs to dispose of their lands. June 9; No. 29.

1717. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, informing him of the allowance to be granted to excluded Zamíndárs in his District, June 9; and also transmitting him the rule to be observed respecting disputed lands, etc. June 9.

1718. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, directing him to make publication regarding the Zamíndár of Chituá, and to report the result. June 4.

1719. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, enclosing a report from the Accountant to the Board, on the representation of the Zamíndár of Kásijorá. The Board rejected his claim to remission of balance due from him, and directed the Collector to make demand for an immediate payment, and in the event of delay, to sell his lands. June 9; No. 21.

1720. Letter to Collector of Maimansinh, informing him that the lands of the late Zamíndár of Ranbhawál are to be sold to discharge his balance. June 2.—Second letter on June 2, No. 6, stating that a portion of the Zamíndárí is to be sold in liquidation of the balance, and the remainder to be settled on the legal heir, provided he be not disqualified.

1721. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, authorizing the Tálukdár of Sidhbátí to sell his Táluk. June 28; No. 3.

1722. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, stating that he has deputed his Head Assistant to investigate the claim of the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm on the non-resident (Páíkásht) rayats. June 5; No. 37.

1723. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, proposing that Parganá Pukhariá be sold in liquidation of balance due to the Government by the Zamíndár. May 31; No. 10. Answered, June 16, No. 11, directing him to select other lands for sale instead of Pukhariá.

1724. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhi, stating that if the amount due by the Zamíndár for investiture fee (Peshkásh), and the sum due to Mr. Eliot, is not paid before the first of next month, a portion of his land is to be sold to liquidate the same. June 14; No. 44.

1725. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhi, transmitting definitive reply of the Rájá Rámkrishna on the Decennial Settlement, and requesting a speedy determination relative thereto. June 8; Nos. 7 and 8. Answered, June 25, No. 9, in which the Board require the Collector's opinion on the objections made by the Zamíndár, and desiring that he will on all future occasions accompany all such representations with his opinion.

1726. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, transmitting a petition from Ambahádur Sháh, son of the rebel Fathi Sháh, representing the distressed situation of his mother and family. May 10; Nos. 2 and 3. Answered, June 25, transmitting him para. of letter from the Council that the petitioner is not entitled to any support.

1727. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, reporting on perpetual leases in Tappá Marwá and Hávilí Hájipur. June 14; No. 13.

1728. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh, transmitting the petition of the Zamíndárs relative to the late resolutions respecting Tálukdárs, with his sentiments on the same. May 25; Nos. 4 to 6. Answered, June 7; No. 7.

1729. Circular Letter to Collectors, furnishing them with instructions for the assessment of Táluks. June 9.

1730. Circular Letters to Bengal Collectors, furnishing them with instructions respecting payment of the allowances of Kánúngos, Kázís, and pensioners. June 9.

1731. Circular Letter to Bengal Collectors, informing them of allowances granted to excluded Zamíndárs, and also of the rule to be observed respecting disputed lands and joint proprietors. June 25.

1732. Circular Letter to Collectors, informing them of resolution of Council on rates of exchange, and that all rupees except Sikká remitted by them to the Presidency will be recoined; and also informing them of the orders of Council regarding the sale of lands paying a revenue not exceeding Rs. 1000. June 30.

1733. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting the propriety of being vested with discretionary power of determining on the objections of the landholders to the assessment (Jamá) required. June 25; No. 10.

1734. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that the dispossessed Zamíndárs in Bengal are to receive the same allowances as those in Behar. June 23; No. 15.

1735. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting letters from the Collector of Nadiyá relative to the Tálukdárs of that District, and proposing to postpone the Decennial Settlement in Nadiyá. June 30; No. 10.

1736. Minute by Mr. Wm. Cowper, agreeing with Mr. Graham on the impropriety of immediately separating the Tálukdárs from the jurisdiction of the Zamíndárs. June 30; No. 13.

## JULY, 1790.

1737. Letter to Accountant of the Board, informing him that it is intended to form a settlement for ten years, including in some instances a progressive increase (Rasad) of the rent extending to the third year, and requesting that he will submit a form accordingly. July 16.

1738. Petition from Baidya Náth, complaining that the Diwan of the Collector of Purniah has attached his lands, and begging the same may be released. July 5; No. 12.

1739. Petition from Hari Prasád Rái, Zamíndár of 7 as. (or seven-sixteenths share) Muhammadáminpur, begging that his land may not be sold, and that the engagement entered into by him may be returned. July; No. 22.

1740. Petition from Zamíndár of Swarúppur, submitting an answer to the order (Parwáná) on the Decennial Settlement. July; Nos. 19 and 20.

1741. Petition from Gangánáráyan Chaudhrí, a proprietor of Kismat Parganá Bhuluá, begging payment of his proportion from the newly annexed (Makhlút) lands of Bhuluá. July; No. 27.

1742. Petition from Zamíndár of Swarúppur, submitting his final answer on the settlement of his Zamíndárí. July; No. 16.

1743. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, submitting a question on the order relative to Company's lands. June 27; No. 6. Answered, July 5, No. 7, stating that the order referred to lands belonging to the Company by purchase or grants, the proprietary right not being vested in any of their subjects.

1744. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, submitting a request from the Tálukdárs appertaining to other Districts to pay their rents in Bírbhúm. June 16; No. 17. Answered, July 5, No. 18, requiring further information in the matter.

1745. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, enclosing letters from his Second Assistant on claims of the non-resident (Páíkásht) rayats. July 2; Nos. 53 to 55. Answered, July 7, No. 56, requiring further information.

1746. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, enclosing a petition from the Tálukdár of Máliárá requesting to be put in possession of his Táluk, and to have settlement made with him. June 22; Nos. 22 and 23. Answered, July 12, No. 24, desiring him to report if there are any proofs of misrepresentation of the charges exhibited against the Tálukdár.

1747. Letter to Collector of Behar, transmitting him copy of a letter respecting perpetual (Istimrárí) grants made by the Nawábs Mubárak-ud-daulá and Ektiram-ud-daulá, with directions to furnish the list therein required. July 28.

1748. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting a draft of Settlement Statement (Daul Bandobast) proposed for the Decennial Settlement. July 9; Nos. 2 and 3.

1749. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting a list of Táluks with names of the possessors; also reporting on the Bakhshí Daftar

collections, and recommending the abolition thereof. July 9; Nos. 4 to 6.

1750. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting a statement of Dewrí Mahal debts, with the answers of the Rájá to his applications for liquidation thereof. July 12; Nos. 21 to 24.

1751. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, regarding Mr. Chapman's minute on the Settlement of Bardwán. July 23; No. 25.

1752. Minute of Mr. Charles Chapman, conveying his sentiments on the Settlement of the Bardwán District. July 12, No. 9, and July 14, No. 21, and July 14, No. 24.

1753. Minute by Mr. Chapman, disapproving of the letter proposed by the Acting President to be sent to Collectors relative to the Settlement. July 23; No. 8.

1754. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, requesting sanction for confirming sales of Málguzárí lands, which the petty Zamíndárs wish to dispose of. July 12; Nos. 5 and 6. Answered, July 26, authorizing the above sale.

1755. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them a para. of a letter from Council guaranteeing to excluded proprietors the payment of the allowances stipulated to be paid them by the farmers, etc. July 9.

1756. Circular Letter to Bengal Collectors, transmitting them extracts of resolutions of Government for the formation of the Behar Decennial Settlement, respecting the species of rupees in which the settlements are to be made, and directing them to conform thereto. July 9.

1757. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them resolutions of Council respecting Tálukdárs, with directions to publish the orders therein contained for general information. July 12.

1758. Circular Letters to Collectors (with the exception of Calcutta and the 24 Parganás), authorizing them to allow the landholders to mortgage or sell their lands to enable them to discharge their balances, taking care to transmit the deeds to be registered. July 14; No. 5.

1759. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them para. of a letter from the Council vesting the Board with power to hold lands khas, or to let them out in farm where the Zamíndárs decline engaging at the Jamá fixed. July 19.

1760. Letter from Commissioner of Kuch Behar, submitting question on

the Settlement of Bijni and Karaibárí, and stating that he has deputed a Sazáwal to Rángámáti to secure the realization of the revenues. June 14; No. 33. Answered, July 9, No. 34, giving instructions for Settlement of Bijni and Karaibárí, and approving of his having stationed a Sazáwal at Rangámátí at the expense of the Zamíndár.

1761. Letter from Mr. Wm. Cowper, laying before the Board letters from Collector of Purniah in answer to petitions referred to him from the Khálsá, and submits the suggesting to Council some regulation for rendering more prompt and easy the determining on complaints against the decision of the Collectors. July 2; No. 9.

1762. Minute by Mr. W. Cowper, dissenting from Mr. Chapman *in re* the Bardwán Settlement. July 14; No. 23.

1763. Letter from Collector of Dacca, stating that he has attached the land of certain Tálukdárs who absconded after resisting the service of a process upon them, and requests orders on the subject. July 1; No. 43.

1764. Letter from Collector of Dacca, stating that he has attached 3 annas and 6 gandás, or one-fifth share, of Tappá Bánkipur, in consequence of the proprietor's (Rám Rám's) contumacious conduct. June 29; No. 59.

1765. Letter from Collector of Dacca, submitting the names of sundry Mahals, the proprietors of which refuse to enter into engagement on the terms proposed; the Zamíndárs of Rasúlpur have entered into engagements. June 25; No. 8. Answered, July 9, No. 11, giving instructions for the settlement of Mahals mentioned in foregoing letter.

1766. Letter from Collector of Dacca, suggesting the propriety of making female proprietors equally responsible with male proprietors, and the manager sworn to faithful discharge of trust. June 29; No. 10.

1767. Letter from Governor-General in Council, revoking previous order relative to sale of lands, the Jamá of which shall not exceed Rs. 1000, and adopting the Board's proposition of 16th June. June 30; No. 2.

1768. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting extract of the Board's proceedings relative to Bází Zamín resumptions. July 2; No. 13.

1769. Letter from Governor-General in Council, vesting the Board with

discretional authority to determine on objections of the landholders to the Jamá demanded from them. June 13; No. 14.

1770. Letter from Governor-General in Council, with resolutions respecting Tálukdárs, and expecting the Decennial Settlement be concluded in the several Districts immediately, except in Dacca, Maimansinh, and Tipperah. July 9; No. 1.

1771. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Bardwán respecting the settlement of that District, and recommending the settlement be made at present for the current year only. July 12; No. 8.

1772. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Behar relative to perpetual grants (Mukarraris), and recommending that Mukarrarí grants made subsequent to the Company's acquisition to the Díwání be disallowed. July 12; No. 21.

1773. Letter from Governor-General in Council, in explanation of order of 19th May relative to Tálukdárs who have lost their Sanads. July 16; No. 3.

1774. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, authorizing him to advance to the landholders whose lands were farmed for the past year by the Kánúngo, the amount of their proprietary allowance (Málikáná), and to recover the same from the Kánúngo. July 9.

1775. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, agreeing to request of Kálí Prasád Rái, Zamíndár of three-eighths or 6 annas share of Muhammadáminpur, for leave to mortgage part of his lands in order to discharge last year's balance. July 5; No. 13.

1776. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, submitting proposal from the Zamíndár for the Decennial Settlement. July 2; Nos. 16 and 17. Answered, July 12, No. 18, requiring information on several points previous to determining on the assessment (Jamá) of his District.

1777. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, proposing the khás Settlement of his District for the current year. July 13; No. 12.

1778. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, enclosing him copy of the final answer of the Zamíndár of Swarúppur on the settlement of his Zamíndárí, and desiring the Collector to advertise it to be let in farm for ten years. July 23; No. 17.

1779. Letter from Collector of Silhet, submitting a plan for consolidation of Parganás. June 21; Nos. 17 and 18. Answered July 14, No. 19, agreeing to the foregoing proposition.

1780. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, enclosing abstract of villages not engaged for by proprietors, and deeds of relinquishment, etc. July 10; No. 19. Answered, July 30, No. 25, cannot agree to any of the deeds of relinquishment, and repeating directions respecting proprietors who decline to engage at the assessment (Jamá) fixed. July 30; No. 25.

1781. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, stating that the Landholders are at liberty to pay revenue either in Sikká rupees or the specie received from under-renters. July 21; No. 16.

1782. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing him to release Rájá Náráyan Sinh, and restore him to his lands. July 21.

1783. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them orders of Council respecting Tálukdárs who have lost their Sanads. July 21.

1784. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that Istimrárí Sanads granted previous to the Company's accession to the Díwání to be continued in force, also all Mukarrarí grants; such as have been obtained since the Díwání, the Mukarrarídárs to be dispossessed; where Táluks have been held at a fixed rent (Jamá) for the last 12 years, the Decennial Settlement is to be made at the present Jamá. July 16; No. 7.

1785. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting proposition of the Board relative to Tálukdárs separated from the jurisdiction of Zamíndárs. July 28; No. 17.

## AUGUST, 1790.

1786. Petition from Zamíndár of Kásijorá, submitting his claim to be exonerated from payment of the balances of 1188. August 17.

1787. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, transmitting a proposal from Rájá Dámodar Sinh for Ten Years' Settlement of Bishnupur. April 15, Nos. 37 to 39; May 10, Nos. 40 to 42; June 4, Nos. 43 and 44; June 14, No. 45; and June 26, No. 46.

1788. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, submitting the proposed Decennial Settlement for Bengal Districts. July 22; No. 7. Answered, August 6, No. 8, approving of the proposed Settlement.

1789. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, conveying him instructions for adjustment of the Bardwán Dewrí Debts. August 2.

1790. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, transmitting him orders of

Council on his letters on the subject of the Decennial Settlement of his District. August 4.

1791. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, enclosing the Rájá's answer to his letter on subject of Settlement. August 11; Nos. 15 and 16.

1792. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, enclosing answer of the Proprietors of Mandalghát to requisition to renew their engagements for the revenues of that Parganá, with his sentiments thereon. August 14; Nos. 18 to 20.

1793. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, directing him to demand payment of the Dewrí debts from the Rájá without delay. August 23; No. 25.

1794. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, transmitting him order of Council to conclude Decennial Settlement. August 27.

1795. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, conveying him instructions on balances due from Jainaráin Ghoshál, Abdúl Majid, Sumá Ullá, Braja Sib Chandra, and the Sandwíp Zamíndárs. August 2; No. 12.

1796. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, requests instructions on the Settlement of Sandwíp, as the Zamíndárs decline engaging, enclosing objections set forth by them, with his opinion thereon. July 18; Nos. 15 and 16.

1797. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, transmitting proposals tendered for farming Sandwíp for the term of three years by Rám Charan Ghosh. July 26; 17 and 17a.

1798. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, forwarding a statement of the Assessment Statement (Jamábandí) of the lands of Sandwíp in possession of the Zamíndár of Dakshín Shábázpur, and claimed by the Farmer of Sandwíp. May 25; Nos. 19 to 22.

1799. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, with instructions for the Settlement of Sandwíp, and requiring further information on the subject of the land claimed by Farmer of Sandwíp. August 6; No. 23.

1800. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them extract of a letter from Council relative to perpetual grants (Mukarrarís) and assessment of land held at a fixed rent (Jamá) for the past twelve years, for their information. August 2.

1801. Circular Letter to Bengal Collectors, furnishing them with question from the Board to the Council regarding the standard by

which the rent (Jamá) is to be fixed for the Decennial Settlement, with copy of his Lordship's orders thereon. August 4.

1802. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them extract of a letter from Council relative to the Nirikhbandí of lands, with directions to publish the same. August 6.

1803. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting extract of a Letter from Council relative to purchased (Kharidí) Táluks. Answered, August 6.

1804. Letter to Collector of Dacca, informing him of an abatement made by Council of the Jamá of several Mahals. August 2 and August 25.

1805. Letter from Collector of Dacca, submitting his opinion on the pleas urged by the proprietors of sundry Mahals for declining to engage on the terms proposed by Government. July 19; No. 3.

1806. Letter from Collector of Dacca, submitting objections of Zamíndárs who decline engaging on the terms proposed by Government, with his sentiments on the validity of the same. July 28; No. 4.

1807. Letter from Governor-General in Council, with orders on the question regarding the standard by which the rent (Jamá) is to be fixed for the Decennial Settlement of the Bengal Districts. July 28; No. 1.

1808. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that such part of Hasipur as belonged to the rebel Fathi Sháh be conferred on the son of the late Mashidah (?), and on the leases being confirmed to him, to receive allowance fixed for disqualified Landholders. July 28; No. 5.

1809. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that Landholders are to adjust instalments of rents according to time of reaping and selling the produce; respecting attachment of crops by the Zamíndárs; rescinding the 27th Article of Regulations for Bengal Decennial Settlement respecting leases (Pattás); and agreeing to accept the Zamíndár of Rájsháhi's proposal to pay the Hastobúd Jamá of Swarúppur, if declined by Dhupnaráyan. July 30; No. 1.

1810. Letter from Governor-General in Council, conveying instructions regarding the Commission and proprietary allowance (Dasturhát and Málikáná) in the Málguzárí lands of Rájá Madhu Sinh. August 6; No. 24.

1811. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that the Regula-

tions of February last relative to Tálukdárs are nullified and revoked: Zamíndárs are to be liable to penalties for any exactions made from Tálukdárs. August 6; No. 25.

1812. Letter from Governor-General in Council, forwarding a resolution respecting Khedirá (?) Táluks in Jessor, which is to be extended to all of a similar nature in the Bengal Districts. The clause revoked in the 16th Article of Regulations for the Bengal Decennial Settlement, respecting Tálukdárs, is to remain in force with regard to Khedirá Táluks. August 6; No. 30.

1813. Letter from Collector of Jessor, requesting orders on application from the Tálukdars of Mahmúdsháhí to be separated from the Zamíndárs. August 2, No. 12; August 18, No. 21. Answered, August 23; No. 22.

1814. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, directing him to suspend sale of lands of the Zamíndár of Kásijorá. August 4.

1815. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, stating that the Board cannot agree to the proposed assessment (Jamá) for Zamíndáris comprehending Táluks which may be entitled to separation. August 13; No. 13.

1816. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, on balances of Narsinh Deo Rái, Zamíndár of Baridháti and Háthiágarh, and relative to Settlement of Háthiágarh. August 20; Nos. 21 and 21b. Answered, August 27, informing him that he will hereafter be informed on subject of foregoing, and directing him to set Narsinh Deo Rái at liberty.

1817. Letter from Collector of Purniah, stating that he had released the Zamíndár of Dhapar on his paying his balance. July 19; No. 18.

1818. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh, directing him to annex the Khás Khámár lands of the Zamíndár of Pánchet to his Málguzárí lands. August 25.

1819. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, enclosing answer of Rájá Madhu Sinh to an order (Parwáná) respecting the assessment (Jamá) of his Milkat. June 4; Nos. 9 and 10. Answered, August 6, No. 25, enclosing him orders of Council on commission and proprietary allowance (Dasturhát and Málikáná) of Rájá Madhu Sinh, and directing the Collector again to tender the Settlement to him.

1820. Circular Letter to Collector, transmitting para. of letter from Council relative to the Khámár and other private lands held by Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs. August 25.

## SEPTEMBER, 1790.

1821. Petition from Lakshmí Saraswatí, Zamíndárin of Táherpur, praying to be reinstated in her Zamíndárí, and for a report to be required from the Collector on her dispossession. September 1.

1822. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, directing him to take the attachment off Táluk Máliárá, and to conclude Settlement with the Tálukdár. September 20.

1823. Letter to Collector of Behar, approving of the proposed assessment (Jamá) for the resumed portion of Sháhjahánpur, and the consequent abatement. September 3.

1824. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, directing him that, in the event of the proprietors of Champánagar, Jitor Nayá Dás, and Rasúlpur being in arrear, their lands are to be sold; authorizing advance of Takáví, and requesting explanation of the necessity thereof. September 6; No. 28.

1825. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, with instructions relative to the rent (Jamá) to be paid by the proprietors of Mandalghát, etc. September 1.

1826. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, stating that he has resumed and held khás, the Aimá or rent-free lands granted for religious purposes by the Zamíndár to one of his dependants. August 26; No. 6. Answered, September 3, No. 7, confirming the resumption of the land, and requiring report of Jamá to be fixed thereon.

1827. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting his correspondence with the Rájá on last order to conclude Decennial Settlement; recommends a khás collection for three years. September 4; Nos. 19 and 20.

1828. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, enclosing a communication from the Rájá on the subject of the Settlement. September 5; Nos. 21 and 22.

1829. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, directing that further proposals be made to the Rájá for settlement. September 8; No. 23.

1830. Minute by Mr. Chas. Chapman, conveying his sentiments on the opinion of the Advocate-General regarding the power of the Supreme Court to take cognisance of acts done by the Collector of Calcutta. September 1; No. 26.

1831. Minute by Mr. Chas. Chapman, stating his opinion on claim of Zamíndár of Kásijorá to be exonerated from the payment of

the balance of his Zamíndárí for 1188 B.S. September 6; No. 11.

1832. Minute by Mr. Chapman, conveying his sentiments on the petition of the Zamíndár of Chittagong complaining of oppressive assessment (Jamá) levied on him, and begging a statement of the assessment and resources of the Zamíndárí. September 13; No. 13.

1833. Minute by Mr. Chapman, proposing that balances should be decided on with the least possible delay, and to give up all outstanding arrears contracted 12 years previous to Decennial Settlement. September 13; No. 15.

1834. Minute by Mr. Chapman on Mukarrarí Leases. September 24; No. 18.

1835. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, transmitting a petition of the Zamíndár, begging to be relieved from excessive Jamá. August 30; Nos. 8 to 10. Answered, September 13, No. 11, desiring the Collector to report his opinion on the Zamíndár's representation.

1836. Circular Letter to Bengal Collectors, transmitting them extract of a letter from Council relative to allowances to the proprietors of separated Táluks, and requiring from them statements of the supposed gross assets where the assessment (Jamá) has been fixed on estimate of the produce. September 1; No. 4.

1837. Circular Letter to Collector, directing them to release Landholders confined for balances, in all instances where sale of their lands is ordered for discharge of such balances, and where such sale shall appear sufficient to liquidate the amount due. September 3; No. 17.

1838. Letter to Collector of Dacca, authorizing abatements in sundry Táluks, and also remissions consequent on the abolition of various duties. September 3.

1839. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that the proprietors of Mandalghát are to be considered responsible for the Jamá which they bound themselves to pay in perpetuity. August 27; No. 2.

1840. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that proprietors of separated Táluks are to be allowed 10 per cent. on the collections, with the exception of cases where a fixed rent (Jamá) has been paid for 12 years, etc. August 25; No. 3.

1841. Letter from Governor-General in Council, ordering lands of the

Zamíndárs in 24 Parganás to be sold in liquidation of their balances. August 25; No. 8.

1842. Letter from Governor-General in Council, revoking previous orders for suspension of sale of the lands of Narsinh Deo Rái, and directing the sale to be made. September 1; No. 29.

1843. Letter from Governor-General in Council, giving the Board discretionary power to fix progressive rent (Rasad) of separated Táluks. September 3; No. 1.

1844. Minute by Mr. T. Graham, *re* power of Supreme Court to take cognisance of revenue affairs in Calcutta. September 1.

1845. Letter to Collector of Jessor, with instructions for assignment of separated Táluks, and regarding the five years' progressive rent (Rasad) proposed by him. September 1; No. 5.

1846. Letter from Collector of Jessor, stating that the Tálukdár of Kálidás has been put under restraint for non-payment of balances due by him. June 10; No. 14.

1847. Minute by Mr. Law, dissenting from Mr. Graham on perpetual deed of grants (Mukarrarí Sanads). September 24; No. 19.

1848. Letter to Preparer of Reports, directing him to publish an advertisement at the Khálsá and in the Gazette, notifying the intention of Government to farm the Bardwán Zamíndárí. September 17. And also on September 29, that the Rájá of Bardwán shall not be allowed to farm the District.

1849. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, transmitting from Bholá Náth, banker, a petition praying that until Rájá Madhu Sinh's debt to him is liquidated, he may have the collection of his commission (Dasturhát) from rent-free lands. August 17; Nos. 10 and 11.

1850. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, enclosing answer of Rájá Madhu Sinh refusing to engage for settlement of his Milkíat lands. September 11; Nos. 5 to 7. Answered, September 24, No. 8, authorizing him to farm the Milkíat lands of Rájá Madhu Sinh for 10 years.

1851. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, enclosing the answer of the Rájá to the Decennial Settlement, and the steps taken for farming the District, and requesting an order (Parwáná) to the Rájá directing him to deliver over the accounts. September 14; No. 4. Answered, September 17, No. 6, forwarding an order (Parwáná) to the Rájá.

1852. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting answer received

from the Rájá to the order (Parwáná) to him to deliver up his accounts. September 21; Nos. 26 and 27. Answered, September 24, No. 28, stating that the Board had no objections to the Rájá's coming to the Presidency.

1853. Letter from Governor-General, approving of proceedings in the matter of the Bardwán Settlement.

1854. Letter to Collector of Jessor, directing that, in case the Tálukdár of Kántidáspur fails to discharge his balance within the period fixed by him, to transmit a statement of his lands to be sold. September 20; No. 15.

1855. Letter to Collector of Dacca, with instructions on settlement of Mahals respecting abatements in the assessment (Jamá), and on separation of Táluks. September 24; No. 16.

1856. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, informing the Board that the Rájá has proceeded towards Calcutta contrary to orders, and without settling accounts. September 27; No. 8.

1857. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, enclosing letter from Council on the subject of the Rájá's coming to the Presidency. September 29; No. 10.

1858. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing petition from Tálukdár of Sandwíp setting forth oppressive conduct of the Zamíndár; and in consequence of the Zamíndár's contumacy, he (the Collector) had put his lands under charge of a Sazáwal. September 3; Nos. 12 and 13. Answered, September 27, No. 14, directing the Collector to issue a notification requiring the attendance of the Zamíndár of Sandwíp, and in the event of his not attending within 15 days, to farm his lands.

## OCTOBER, 1790.

1859. Petition from Zamíndár of Bardwán, stating that he will remain a short time near Calcutta, and pay the demands of Government. October 1.

1860. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, relative to non-resident (Páik-asht) rayats. July 27; Nos. 23 to 25.

1861. Letter from Collector of Behar, recommending deduction from the assessment (Jamá) of a portion of Parganá Alínaurá; forwarding a petition from the Zamíndár, with a comparative statement of net Jamá for former three years, and excess obtained in forming Ten Years' Settlement, with proposed deduction from

that excess. September 29; Nos. 4 and 6. Answered, October 26, authorizing proposed abatement.

1862. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, informing of an order (Parwáná) to the Rájá to deliver over charge of all prisoners in his custody to him. October 2.

1863. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, informing of the Rájá's return, stating that he has called on him for balance accounts, etc. October 7; No. 10.

1864. Circular Letter to Bengal Collectors, furnishing them with explanation of orders of Government respecting the private lands of the Zamíndárs. October 1; No. 12.

1865. Circular Letter to Collectors, directing them to annex the Chákrán lands to the Málguzárí lands of the Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs, and that they be subject to public assessment. October 13; No. 50.

1866. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that four villages formerly taken from the Zamíndár of Pánchet be restored to him. October 20; No. 5.

1867. Letter to Collector of Jessor, in answer to questions relative to private lands of the Zamíndárs. October 1; No. 4.

1868. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, transmitting him copy of letter from Council relative to attachment of the lands of the Zamíndár of Bahádurpur, with directions to report the measures taken. October 15.

1869. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, communicating rule for Settlement of joint estates undivided. October 26; No. 22.

1870. Letter to Collector of Maimansinh, directing him to take attachment from off the lands of the Zamíndár of Nawábád. October 18.

1871. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, on subject of claim of Zamíndár of Bírbhúm on non-resident (Páíkásht) rayats. October 23; Nos. 16 and 17.

1872. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh, approving of the Decennial Settlement of Behar Districts, and directing him to call on the Zamíndárs to execute new Kabúliyats. October 8; No. 6.

1873. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh, directing him to discontinue idol-worship (Debatá Púja) allowance in Panchet. October 13.

1874. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, transmitting petition from Zamíndárs relative to orders on their private lands, and re-

marks on the new Settlement. September 18; Nos. 8 to 10. Answered, October 1; No. 11.

1875. Letter to Acting Collector of Rangpur, transmitting petition from Zamíndár of Swarúppur, and authorizing him to accept the proposal of Muhammad Takí for settlement of Swarúppur. October 13; No. 27.

1876. Letter to Collector of Sháhábád, transmitting him resolution of Council on Málikáná villages of Babu Sanátan Sinh and Jagannáth Sinh. October 26.

1877. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, recommending suspension in demands of revenue, owing to the lands having overflowed, and the harvest in many places totally destroyed. October 4; No. 15. Answered, October 13, No. 16, directing him to grant such suspensions as may be absolutely necessary.

1878. Letter to Mr. W. Cowper, informing him that the Governor-General expressed a desire that the Board should compel the Rájá of Bardwán to return to the District, and requesting him to order a Head Peon (Mirdáha), etc., to conduct the Rájá to the Collector. October 8; No. 11.

1879. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting his correspondence with the Rájá on collections made by him, and his reasons for declining to receive visits from him. October 12; Nos. 21 and 22.

1880. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, with instructions for final adjustment of the accounts with the Rájá. October 15; No. 23.

1881. Letter to Governor-General in Council, recommending compliance with the offer of Rántá, a Hill chief, to become a Zamíndár under the Company, and pay revenue. October 29; No. 20.

1882. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh, informing that Rántá, the Hill chief, is not dependent on any Zamíndár in his District. May 11; No. 18.

NOVEMBER, 1790.

1883. Petition from Rájá Huzúri Mall, and Rájá Dal Chand, begging suspension of sale of lands belonging to Zamíndár of Bardwán, ordered to be made to liquidate sum due to them. November 26; No. 14.

1884. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, authorizing to depute an Amín to

1897. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing petition of Níl Kánt Sinh praying for the remission of the assessment (Jamá), or for certain sandbanks (Chars) to be handed over to him. November 16; Nos. 19 and 20. Answered, November 29, No. 21, declining to comply with the request.

1898. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, informing him that a portion of the lands of the Zamíndár is to be sold in liquidation of balance, and no further monthly allowance (Musháhará) to be paid him until he gives an account of his private lands. November 26.

## DECEMBER, 1790.

1899. Petition from Tálukdár of Baliá Mallikpur in Jessor, requesting the Zamíndár may be compelled to refund amount collected by him beyond the established dues. December 3; No. 13.

1900. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting extract of proceedings on the Bardwán Settlement. December 1; No. 15.

1901. Letter from Governor-General in Council, confirming engagement concluded for Mahals in Bardwán. December 3; No. 7.

1902. Letter to Governor-General in Council, recommending that Landholders be allowed to distrain for rents due to them from their tenants, under certain restrictions, and submitting proceedings of the Board on the subject. No date.

1903. Letter to Governor-General in Council, recommending that the proprietary allowance (Málikáná) of the Zamíndár of Bardwán, and all other dispossessed Landholders, be paid in money. December 22; No. 13.

1904. Letter from Governor-General in Council, forwarding resolutions on alienated lands. December 1; No. 1.

1905. Minute by Mr. T. Graham, regarding the Settlement of Bardwán. December 1, No. 9; and December 1, No. 14.

1906. Letter to Collector of Jessor, authorizing him to assess an equitable revenue on all Táluks granted at a reduced rent (Jamá). December 3; No. 15.

1907. Minute by Mr. T. Law, regarding the Bardwán Settlement. December 1; No. 8.

1908. Minute by Mr. Law, giving his opinion on inconveniences and losses to which Zamíndárs and farmers are exposed for want of local jurisdiction to enforce payment of rents. December 15; Nos. 29 and 33.

Ghulám Husain, declining to engage on account of oppressive excess of the assessment (Jamá); proposals had been issued in consequence for the farming of the lands. January 4; No. 27.

1921. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them orders of Council prohibiting Tahsíldárs purchasing lands in their own jurisdiction, with instructions to publish the same. January 14.

1922. Letter from Commissioner of Kuch Behar, with a proposal of Settlement of Rángámáti for 1197 B.S., recommending postponement of the Decennial Settlement. November 14; No. 12. Answered, December 17, No. 19, with remarks and orders relative to the Settlement of Rángámáti.

1923. Letter to Collector of Dacca, transmitting him orders of Council for the waste land (Jangalburí) Tálukdárs to continue subject to the authority of the Zamíndárs, and for him to investigate the claim of these Tálukdárs to be exempted from having their lands measured. January 5.

1924. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, forwarding application made to the Commanding Officer at Tánjipur for military assistance. January 10; No. 2.

1925. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, enclosing petition from the mother of the Rájá, desiring him to report on the allegations contained therein; also whether the Rání has delivered up the seals, and whether there be any objections to her returning to Dinájpur. January 19; No. 24.

1926. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting proceedings on the subject of Musháhará to be paid the Zamíndár of Dharmpur, and recommendation thereon. January 3; No. 6.

1927. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing letter from Commissioner of Kuch Behar on the Settlement of Rángámáti; recommend proposeding Sazáwal's establishment, and a sanction to the decrease of the assessment (Jamá). January 3; No. 20.

1928. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing to Board's proposition respecting balances of the Faslí Mahals in Bhágalpur, and approving of a Takáví advance; requiring reasons for recommendation for the immediate Decennial Settlement of Khás Mahals in Bhágalpur; on power of Landholders to recover rents from tenants. December 24; No. 10. Answered, January 5; Nos. 11 and 12.

1929. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting letter from the Accountant, and two from the Collector of Murshidábad,

relative to the payment of the Faujdárí allowances. January 12; No. 13.

1930. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that the Musháhará of dispossessed Landholders is to be paid entirely in money; approving of the Sazáwal's establishment in Rángámáti, and authorizing a decrease of revenue in the Settlement on account of collections abolished. January 7; No. 34.

1931. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing to Board's proposition for the immediate conclusion of the Decennial Settlement in the Tappás of Bhágalpur; the Regulations of April 1788 respecting Takáví advances to be considered in force where lands are held khás; and conveying orders for required advances of Takáví under the Decennial Settlement. January 14; No. 2.

1932. Minute by Mr. T. Law, relative to the proprietary allowance (Málikáná) of the Zamíndárs. January 3; No. 4.

1933. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting answer to the complaints of Rájá of Sundarnáráyan. January 6; No. 13.

1934. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, transmitting a petition of the Rání regarding attachment of her rent-free lands (Nánkár). December 14; No. 15.

1935. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, in reply to above, calling for a statement of the Rájá's monthly allowance (Musháhará), the demand to be suspended in the meantime; the Rání of Midnapur's Nánkár lands to be held in attachment till balance of 1195 is adjusted; Proprietors of Kutabpur to be again required to discharge their balance. January 19; No. 17.

1936. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, enclosing a petition from the rayats of Lashkarpur complaining of exorbitant interest exacted, etc. January 11; No. 5. Answered, January 14; No. 7.

1937. Minute by Mr. D. Vanderheyden, regarding the proprietary allowance (Málikáná) due to the Zamíndárs. January 3; No. 3.

1938. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, transmitting a representation of the Zamíndárs of Taraf Niáz Nazr, declining to execute their engagements, etc. January 8; No. 9. Answered, January 26, No. 11, approving of Collectors having advertised the farm of the Tarafs, etc.

## FEBRUARY, 1791.

1939. Petition from Rájá of Bardwán, begging that his monthly allowance (Musháhará) may be taken for balance of revenue, and the sale of his lands countermanded. January 7; No. 15.

1940. Petition from the Zamíndárs of Salt Mahals in Hijili, begging payment of the monthly allowance (Musháhará) due to them. January 25; No. 16.

1941. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, stating that he has deputed an Amín to adjust differences between the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm and rayats of Bahror. February 12; No. 12.

1942. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, with information on annexations and separations. February 21; No. 5.

1943. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, enclosing a petition from the Rájá of Bardwán's agent (Vákíl), and requiring a statement of balances due from the Rájá after crediting him with his monthly allowance (Musháhará). Answered, February 7; No. 16.

1944. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing a declaration of the Zamíndár of Taraf Jafar Múniám; proposals issued for farming the land, which in the meantime is to be held khás. January 20; No. 7.

1945. Letter to Governor-General in Council, requesting sanction for sale of lands of Zamíndár of Bardwán for discharge of sums due from him, and orders respecting balance due from him on account of 1191. February 18; No. 7.

1946. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Nadiyá, with a petition from the Zamíndár relative to the recovery of balance, etc., and requests consideration of the letter of December last, recommending that the Landholders be allowed to distrain for rent. February 23; No. 9.

1947. Letter from Collector, Murshidábád, transmitting an account of settlement of the separated Táluks. February 8; No. 1. Answered, February 14, No. 2, approving of the rent (Jamá) fixed for separated Tálukdárs.

1948. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, submitting his proposal for the Decennial Settlement of Táluks. February 7; No. 12.

1949. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, requiring information as to whether the produce of private lands, ordered to be annexed to the Málguzárí lands, is included in the stated gross assessment (Jamá). February 9; No. 15.

1950. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, enclosing representation from the Zamíndár of Pánchet regarding his balance, and the measures proposed for discharging it. February 10; No. 41. Answered, February 23, No. 43, approving of measures taken for realization of balance.

1951. Preparer of Reports directed to sell Dihí Husainípur in discharge of demands on the Rájá of Rájsháhi. February 4.

1952. Preparer of Reports directed to suspend sale of lands of Rájá of Bardwán. February 18.

1953. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi, enclosing a petition from the Zamíndár on the sale of Husainípur, etc., and proposing to pay the sum due out of his monthly allowance (Musháhará). February 8; No. 21.

## MARCH, 1791.

1954. Petition from the Tálukdár of Bhág Baruá in Ráujipur Parganá, begging restoration of lands. March 2; Nos. 46 and 47.

1955. Petition from Bhabání Charan Mitra and others, complaining of being dispossessed of their lands by the Collector of Bardwán. March 7; No. 21.

1956. Petition from Agent (Vakíl) of the Zamíndár of Rájsháhi, requesting that the sale of the Zamíndár's land be countermanded, and that the investiture (Peshkásh) fee and the sum due to Mr. Eliot be deducted from the monthly allowance (Musháhará). March 14; No. 12.

1957. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, with instructions to him respecting lands held by the Ghátwáls. March 2.

1958. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, approving of his having enforced the regulations against Zamíndár of Bishnupur for recovery of his balance. March 7; No. 4.

1959. Letters from Collector of Bírbhúm, regarding the Bishnupur balance. March 10 and 22; Nos. 22 and 23. Answered, March 30, No. 24, approving of the Collector's intention of going to Bishnupur if there appears a probability of recovering the balance; if there does not, to submit a statement of lands to be sold.

1960. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting on the petition of Bhabání Charan Mitra, etc., complaining of being dispossessed of lands held by perpetual grant. February 17; No. 22. Answered, March 7, No. 23, requiring further information.

1961. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, requiring his reasons for considering the Zamíndár responsible for deficiencies in the Khás Mahals; the Rájá to repay the present-money (Salámí) received from the Gumáshtás; orders on balances due from Dewri Mahals and Mandalghát. March 9; No. 7.

1962. Minute by Mr. Charles Chapman, regarding proposed letter to Council for making lands, in event of transfers, liable to the payment of all arrears of revenue. March 30; No. 12.

1963. Letter from Collector of Dacca, transmitting a letter from Mr. Thompson on the balances of Rájnagar, with recommendation respecting allowances of the Zamíndárs. March 21; No. 10.

1964. Letter to Collector of Dacca, countermanding the sale of lands of the Zamíndár of 2 as. 17 gandá and 2 kauris Salímábád (nearly one-fifth), and directing the deficiencies on the Khás collection thereof to be written off as irrecoverable. March 28; No. 12.

1965. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, in answer to a petition on the part of the Rání of Dinájpur. February 18; No. 9.

1966. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, enclosing a further petition on part of the Rání, and desiring further information on the several points stated therein, but directing that no further payment be made to her till she delivers up the seal. March 16; No. 12.

1967. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Dacca relative to the payment of allowances to the descendants of Nawábs Ála-ud-daulá and Muhabbat Jang. March 2; No. 19.

1968. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing to proposals respecting the Ghátwáls' lands in Bírbhúm. February 25; No. 48.

1969. Letter from Governor-General in Council, requiring an account of 12 years' balances preceding the Decennial Settlement. February 25; No. 1.

1970. Letter to Governor-General in Council, recommending the establishment of a Tahsíldar in Dinájpur to collect the revenues of the separated Tálukdárs. March 7; No. 18.

1971. Letter from Governor-General in Council, deferring to take into consideration the reform of the Kánúngo Department until the Decennial Settlement is completed. March 11; No. 8.

1972. Letter from Governor-General in Council, authorizing the sale of lands of the Rájá of Bardwán for discharge of balances; will hereafter furnish orders relative to the balance due from the Rájá on account of the year 1191; allowances to dispossessed

1983B. Petition from the Zamíndárs of Mandalghát, representing deficiency of assets of the Zamíndárí. March 21; No. 31.

1984. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, informing that the Tálukdár of Manoharpur has absconded in balance. March 21; No. 12. Answered, March 25, No. 13, directing the issue of a publication requiring the attendance of the absconded Tálukdár under penalty of sale of his lands.

## APRIL, 1791.

1985. Petition from Kamal Lochan, late Farmer of Parganá Plassey (Palási), begging to be released from confinement, and that time be granted him for payment of his balance. April 6; No. 17.

1986. Petition from Agent (Vakíl) of Rájá of Nepál, complaining of encroachment made by the Zamíndár of Mankura Gardá. April 11; No. 14.

1987. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm on the Bishnupur balance, and on the incapacity of the Zamíndár. April 1; No. 8. Answered, April 6, directing him to submit statement of balance due from the Zamíndár, and an account of lands to be sold; to keep the Zamíndár in confinement.

1988. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, requesting instructions relative to the balances due from the Khás Mahals, the Zamíndár having declined giving up the engagement. April 2; No. 1.

1989. Minute by Mr. C. Chapman, stating his opinion that as many of the Zamíndárs of Mandalghát as can be apprehended, should be sent to the Collector of Bárdwán, etc. April 20; No. 12.

1990. Minute by Mr. Chapman, stating his opinion on the deposit offered by proprietors of Mandalghát, and on their request to go to Bardwán unattended by peons. April 25; No. 4.

1991. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, with a question regarding the Miscellaneous Land (Bází Zamín) Regulations. March, No. 22A. Answered, April 18, informing him the Council do not deem it expedient to extend period of retrospection with regard to Rent-free Land (Bází Zamín) Grants.

1992. Circular Letter to Collectors, enclosing them extract of letter from Council, requiring statement of Decennial Settlement. April 11; No. 6.

1993. Letter from Resident of Kuch Behar, stating the necessity

2004. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the Board's orders to the Collector of Bardwán relative to the Khás Mahals of that District. April 15; No. 25. Answered, April 25, No. 9.

2005. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting the statements relative to Kismat Parganá Mágura in 24 Parganás, recommending acceptance of Tálukdár's offer for the settlement, and the consequent abatement from the Jamá of the last year. April 25; No. 20.

2006. Letter from Governor-General in Council, ordering Mandalghát to be sold for the liquidation of the balance. April 22; No. 22.

2007. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing a report from the Collector of Silhet on unfavourable aspect of the season. April 25.

2008. Letter to Governor-General in Council, recommending sale of lands of the Zamíndár of Muhammadáminpur, in liquidation of balance due by him. April 29; No. 7.

2009. Letter to Collector of Jessor, informing him that Mahindrà Deo Rái, Zamíndár of a part of Mahmudsháhí, reports having sent an Agent (Vakíl) to conclude settlement for him. April 1.

2010. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting that Bansidhar Chaudhrí has evaded process of the Civil Court (Díwání Adálat). April 2; No. 17. Answered, April 5, No. 18.

2011. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, desiring him to call on the Proprietor of Táluk Ijám to discharge his balance; and in the event of his non-compliance, to submit a statement of his lands to be sold. April 11; No. 22.

2012. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhi relative to settlement, and enclosing a statement of balances due from the Zamíndárs. March 30; No. 5. Answered, April 8, No. 7, with instructions relative to the sums due by the Zamíndárs, and respecting his monthly allowance (Musháhará).

2013. Preparer of Reports directed to stop the intended sale of Husainpur, and to forward to the Collector of Rájsháhi a statement of sums due from the Zamíndár on account of expenses of Mr. Eliot's deputation. April 8.

2014. Preparer of Reports directed to extend sale of the Zamíndár of Bardwán's lands, for recovery of the amount received by him from Mufassal Gumáshtás. April 15.

2015. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, informing the Board of a

the Zamíndár of Idrakpur in confinement. April 27; No. 14.

2026. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, relative to the proprietary allowance (Málikáná) of the Zamíndár of Swarúppur. April 2; No. 3.

2027. Preparer of Reports directed to dispose of Parganá Mandalghát for liquidation of balances. April 25.

2028. Letter from Governor-General in Council, ordering Board to take immediate measures for realizing the balances due from Bírbhúm, Nadiyá, and Dacca, and to report balance due from Bardwán, and measures taken for enforcing payment of the amount. April 29; No. 28.

## MAY, 1791.

2029. Petition from Agent (Vakíl) of the Rájá of Bardwán, proposing a mode of discharging balances, and requesting revocation of order for sale of Parganás. May 4; No. 28.

2030. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, transmitting a petition from the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm on balance due, and requesting a deduction from the assessment (Jamá) on account of Bázi Sáyer (miscellaneous taxes). April 26; No. 19.

2031. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, in answer to the above, stating that the Board cannot admit the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm's claim to further deductions, but agree to suspend the amount due on account of Sáyer resumed, and allowing the Zamíndár further time to discharge the remaining balance. May 2; No 21.

2032. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, transmitting an account of the balance due from Rájá Chaitan Sinh, with a statement of lands to be sold in liquidation thereof. April 14; No. 1.

2033. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, enclosing a statement of the Jamá of Mahals proposed to be sold for liquidation of balance due from Rájá Chaitan Sinh. April 29; No. 3.

2034. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, requiring an explanation of grounds on which he considers Chaitan Sinh liable to additional assessment, and also further information relative to the assessment of the lands proposed for sale.

2035. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, submitting proposals for farms, and proposes that Parganá Chitwá be sold for liquidation of balances due by the Rájá. May 1; No. 29.

2036. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, approving his proposal for farms. May 2; No. 35.

2049. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, directing him to report what steps have been taken regarding the exchange of lands for the French Factory at Jugdiá. May 18; No. 1.

2050. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, transmitting him proceedings relative to the sale of Parganá Chitwá, and directing him to recommend the Zamíndár to prevent any further sale of his lands by discharging the amount due. May 30; No. 1.

2051. Letter to Preparer of Reports, directing him to advertise and make sale of lands for liquidation of balances due from Zamíndár of Muhammadáminpur, on account of 1197 Bengal Era. May 9.

2052. Letter to Preparer of Reports, directing him to advertise and make sale of lands for liquidation of balances due from the Zamíndár of Bishnupur. May 16.

2053. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing him to continue the pension granted to the widow of the Nawáb Sarájuddaulá to her grand-daughters. May 25.

## JUNE, 1791.

2054. Petition from Tálukdárs of Taraf Jadubátí, etc., representing increase of assessment (Jamá) laid upon them by the Collector of Murshidábád, and begging that he may be directed to make abatements. June 10; No. 22.

2055. Petition from Rájá of Bardwán, submitting a representation on the subject of settlement of his District. May 23; No. 1.

2056. Petition from Muhammad Rezá, complaining of having been dispossessed by the Collector of Chittagong after engaging for ten years for 4. 7, or a little more than one-fourth division of Sandwíp. June 27; No. 22.

2057. Petition from Agent (Vakíl) of Guru Prasád and Abhi Náth, complaining that the Collector of Tipperah holds their Táluk (Nayágáon) Khás, and demands an increase on the fixed assessment (Mukarrarí Jamá). June 27; No. 23.

2058. Petition from widow of Muhammad Asad Zamán Khán, complaining of the Collector of Bírbhúm's delay in investigating her claim to the Zamíndárí, and also of his having attached her monthly allowance (Musháhará). June 27; No. 25.

2059. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, enclosing an order (Parwáná) to the Rájá communicating terms of settlement prescribed, and

missed from the Ráí Ráyán's office, and also sentiments on the inutility of the office, and recommend the abolition thereof. June 20; No. 30.

2070. Letter from Governor-General in Council, authorizing sale of portion of lands of the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm; Forts in Chainpur to be destroyed, in consequence of disturbances reported by the Collector of Sháhábád. June 17; No. 17.

2071. Letter from Governor-General in Council, desiring the Board to notify to the Rájá of Bardwán the displeasure of the Council at his refusing to execute his engagements; and to cause him to quit Calcutta immediately, and inform him that he will be held responsible for any deficiencies. Collector of Bardwán to advertise for proposals for farming the District, the leases of which have been cancelled. June 24; No. 21.

2072. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting the Board's opinion on the expediency of staying action by Rájá of Bardwán until the Settlement shall have been concluded. June 24; No. 22. Answered, June 24, No. 23.

2073. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing (in answer to a petition of the Rájá of Bardwán) him to execute his engagements, and requiring him to proceed to take charge of his District. June 27; No. 28.

2074. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád relative to contumacious conduct of the Zamíndár of Chainpur, and disturbances there: recommends demolition of Forts. June 7; No. 13.

## JULY, 1791.

2075. Petition from Sítárám Bhat, requesting an order to the Collector of Bírbhúm to investigate his right to lands forcibly taken from him by the Zamíndár, and to reinstate him in possession. July 1; No. 26.

2076. Petition from Sionáráyan Misra and others, inhabitants of Champáran, representing oppressions of Jagmohan, Zamíndár, and of his having forcibly dispossessed them of their estates. July 1; No. 27.

2077. Petition from the Zamíndárs of Muhammadámínpur, requesting that the order for sale of their lands may be countermanded, and that they be allowed to liquidate the balance due by mortgaging their Zamíndárí. July 8; No. 4.

from proprietors of Mandalghát in Bardwán District. August 12; No. 31.

2114. Letter from Preparer of Reports, enclosing account of Sanad fees from 12th May 1788 to 11th August 1791; also a list of Sanads ordered but not taken out. August 11; No. 35.

2115. Letter to Collector of Sháhábád, transmitting him resolution of Council respecting Sagwán Lál, who attempted to incite an insurrection in Chainpur. August 22.

2116. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing that the Settlement of the Rájnagar Zamíndárí be offered to the Zamíndárs at the Jamá specified, and in the event of their refusal the lands to be held khás. August 17; No. 19.

2117. Minute by Mr. D. Vanderheyden, respecting Management and Settlement of Bardwán District. August 22, No. 30; and August 29, No. 25.

2118. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them Regulation respecting the confinement of Landholders for arrears of revenue. August 26.

2119. Letter from Preparer of Reports, reporting on the rights of the purchasers of Bishnupur lands to certain Mahals claimed by them. August 17; No. 19.

2120. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, transmitting a petition from the Chaudhrí of Kánkjol declining his former proposal of engaging for a rent (Jamá) of Rs. 30,500. July 7; No. 12. Answered, August 31, No. 14, requiring Collector's opinion on objections stated in the above petition.

## SEPTEMBER, 1791.

2121. Petition from Gokul Chánd Mitra, stating that, having paid his share of the Mandalghát balance, he requests release of his Táluk, and that the lands of Sambhu Chánd may be sold on account of the remaining balance, when he will pay any deficiency. September 5; No. 16.

2122. Petition from Sambhu Chánd Rái, representing his having disposed of his portion of Mandalghát to Jagomohan Mitra, and begs that the said Mitra may be made accountable for balance due therefrom, as also to make good the loss he sustained. September 21; No. 37.

2123. Petition from Dowager Ránís of Bardwán, representing their

the losses sustained by Landholders, and to grant certificates of suspension to the sufferers. November 25; No. 43.

## DECEMBER, 1791.

2193. Petition from Rámsankar Háldár, begging to be released from being security for Farmer of Parganá Pájinor in Nadiyá District, and also to be repaid sums disbursed by him. December 5; No. 12.

2194. Petition from rayats of 24 Parganás, requesting suspension of demands till after an inquiry had been made into their losses. December 5; No. 24.

2195. Minute by Mr. Charles Chapman, regarding establishment of Petty Courts throughout the provinces. December 21; No. 31.

2196. Letter from Governor-General in Council, allowing Landholders in the 24 Parganás to the end of the year for delivery of certificates granted on account of the inundation of 1196 Bengal Era, and authorizing their being received in payment of balance of said year; directing that the Aimá Tenures in Bardwán be separated from the jurisdiction of the Rájá, and that he be informed of the deduction he will be entitled to on account thereof. December 2; No. 22.

2197. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting on the state of his District, transmitting a statement of gross remaining assets in Parganá Mainachaurá, together with a statement of amount of Takáví necessary to be advanced to the rayats. December 18; No. 8.

2198. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, transmitting him instructions respecting indulgences to be granted, and directing him to forward an estimate of probable deficiency in resources of the country for the current year. December 28.

2199. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, enclosing representation from the Zamíndár on the calamities of the season, and his inability to discharge the revenue. November 30; No. 1.

2200. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, desiring him to report the amount necessary to be suspended, and the period within which it may be recovered; also the measures he proposes to adopt for relief of the suffering rayats. December 5; No. 3.

2201. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, reporting amount of suspensions

in the payment of his instalments of revenue, and for an investigation into his losses from drought. January 3; No. 9.

2210. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, in reply, transmitting him instructions from Council regarding applications for suspensions, and authorizing him to allow the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm suspensions under the rules laid down. January 6; No. 11.

2211. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting orders of Council prohibiting the exportation of grain by sea. January 16; No. 1.

2212. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Behar regarding lands forsaken or neglected, and recommending that he be authorized to put up for sale lands of absconded proprietors, and in the event of there being no purchasers, to take them under his own management, and also to notify that absconding proprietors will not during their absence be entitled to proprietary allowance (Málikáná). January 13; No. 12. Answered, January 20, No. 31, agreeing to the above.

2213. Letter to Collector of Jessor, authorizing him to grant the same amount of Takáví advances as last year. January 25; No. 23.

2214. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, reporting on the state of Chainpur, and recommending indulgences to the sufferers. January 14; No. 25. Answered, January 25, No. 26, transmitting instructions from Council for his guidance in granting suspensions, and authorizing him to make such suspensions in Chainpur as he may deem absolutely necessary.

2215. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, reporting that the account of mischief done to the crops was very much exaggerated, and that he sees no reason to grant suspensions. January 9; No. 21.

2216. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, informing of the refusal of the Tálukdárs in Parganá Mágurá to execute their engagements for the rent assessed, and stating that he had accordingly deputed a Sazáwal to collect the revenues. December 29; No. 11. Answered, January 11, approving of the measures which had been adopted.

2217. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, reporting on the claim of the rayats of Mantur to pay their revenue in kind. December 28; No. 24. Answered, January 18, No. 25, desiring him to allow the rayats of Mantur to pay their revenue in kind, and to report regularly the amount of grain received.

the Regulations, upon being assured that the balances have arisen from the calamities of the season. March 19; No. 50.

2244. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, submitting his proceedings during his residence at Mandalghát, with his opinion as to the best way of recovering that Parganá from its impoverished state. February 14; No. 3.

2245. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, in reply, transmitting him instructions from the Council to dispossess the proprietor of Mandalghát, and to take over the management of the Parganá, to complete the repairs of the embankments therein, and to submit statement of requisite advance of Takáví; also directing him to confine the proprietor, and to attach his property. March 19.

2246. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, enclosing a petition from the Zamíndár of Chitwá, requesting a suspension of revenue, and recommending compliance therewith; representing the Zamíndár of Ráipur to be turbulent and extravagant; adding that a purchaser can be found for his Zamíndárí, and that the purchase-money would pay up the amount due. March 7; No. 17.

2247. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, rejecting request of the Zamíndár of Chitwá respecting the payment of his balance, but authorizing suspension from the amount due from him; directing him to proceed against the other persons in balance, according to the Regulations. March 19; No. 18a.

2248. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, reporting that Masúd Khán, the Zamíndár of Taraf Asin Masud, is in balance, and refuses to sign engagements for the settlement of his Zamíndárí. January 26; No. 8.

2249. Circular Letter to Collectors, directing them to submit lists of persons responsible for the payment of outstanding Takáví advances. March 7; Nos. 12 and 13.

2250. Letter to Collector of Dacca, approving of his having concluded settlement with the Tálukdárs separated from Baikunthpur, desiring him to advertise for proposals for farming the lands of the Tálukdárs who decline engaging, and in the event of there being no proposals, to let them to the Zamíndárs, at the rent offered by them. March 16; No. 2.

2251. Letter from Governor-General in Council, regarding a proposed Regulation to prevent managers from farming lands committed to their care. March 2; No. 14.

the lands of the Rájá, in payment of balance of Sanad Fee. March 9; No. 7.

## APRIL, 1792.

2262. Petition from Prán Krishna Sinh, representing that Rájá Dámodar Sinh has attached and made collections from his lands in the Bhitayát Mahals in Bishnupur, and begging redress. April 9; No. 32.

2263. Petition from inhabitants of Mahmúdsháhí, complaining that the Collector of Jessor has attached their Lákhiráj lands. April 9; No. 38.

2264. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, submitting result of inquiries respecting amount of suspensions necessary in consequence of the late drought; also a statement of balances due on account of year 1198. April 6; No. 9.

2265. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, submitting statement of periods proposed for the liquidation of estimated amount of suspensions on account of the drought. April 17; No. 10.

2266. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, informing him of amount authorized to be suspended, and authorizing acceptance of the proposals of the Tálukdárs of Máliárá and Sháhjurá for the payment of the balances due from them. April 25.

2267. Letter to Collector of Behar, approving sale of the lands of Bahádur Sinh, and stating that the Board will wait the result of inquiries into his claims, previous to deciding on measures to be adopted for recovery of the remaining balances due from him. April 25; No. 25.

2268. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, instructing him to complete repair of the embankments (Bandhs) in Mandalghát, to advance Takáví, and to take measures for restoring the cultivation of the lands not included in the leases granted by the Farmer. April 9.

2269. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, stating objections of the Rájá to discharge balance of Dewrí debts payable to Rájá Húzurí Mall and Dal Chánd, for which Kásináth received an assignment. March 22; No. 1.

2270. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, regarding the Zamíndár of Mandalghát's settlement of that Parganá, with his remarks thereon. April 14; No. 17.

a notification issued to prevent anticipation of the revenues of the current year. April 11; No. 26.

2281. Letter to Collector of the Salt Districts, authorizing remissions in Tamluk, on account of the calamities of the season. April 16.

2282. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, forwarding an account of the Zamíndárí of Tipperah, with propositions regarding its settlement; also respecting the present Rájá. February 29; No. 9.

2283. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, relative to the settlement of Amrábád, the Tálukdárs of which refused to agree to the established Jama; enclosing proceedings of the late Collector on complaints of the Tálukdárs relative to the assessment; also forwarding a petition from them in consequence of his call upon them to execute their engagements. April 2; No. 22.

2284. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, approving the grounds upon which his predecessor passed his decision in the case of the Tálukdárs of Amrábád, and giving him instructions on the mode of fixing the assessment. April 9; No. 26.

2285. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, transmitting him copy of the Board's letter to Council respecting the Settlement of Tipperah proper, with answer thereto; and directing him, at the time of concluding the settlement with the Zamíndár, to require him to enter into an engagement for the liquidation of his balances. April 11; No. 23.

2286. Petition from Sibnáráyan Mitra, Farmer of Jahánábád and Bopur in Bardwán, stating that he informed the Collector of Bardwán of his intention to raise money to discharge his balance in the event of his being assured of the continuance in his farm; that the Collector paid no attention to his address, but dispossessed and confined him; and begging to be restored to his lands. April 9; No. 41.

2287. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, instructing him to sell lands belonging to Kálí Prasád and Rájá Rámkrishna for the discharge of balances due. April 30.

2288. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, directing him immediately to put the Rájá into confinement until orders shall have been given for the sale of his lands. April 30; No. 19.

2289. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, reporting that Rájá Chaitan Sinh refuses to execute engagement (Kabúliyat); also transmitting form of engagement signed by him on his Decennial Settlement for the Zamíndárí of Bishnupur. April 19; No. 3.

and submitting the propriety of indulging the Rájá with a Kistbandí for a year. May 11; No. 11.

2300. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, stating that the Board do not conceive the Rájá entitled to any indulgence in payment of assignment to Kási Náth, and desiring him to forward a statement of the lands alluded to for sale. May 14; No. 13.

2301. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting on balances due from the Rájá, and his ability to discharge the amount; proposing that certain Mahals be sold in liquidation of the amount. May 9; No. 5.

2302. Minute by Mr. J. Buller on the proposition of the Acting President, for fixing periods for recovery of outstanding Takáví advances. May 11; No. 38.

2303. Minute by Mr. C. Chapman on the proposition of the Acting President, for fixing periods for recovery of outstanding Takáví advances. May 11; No. 39.

2304. Circular Letter to Collector, transmitting copies of letters from Council relative to the Decennial Settlement, with directions to forward the proposed Decennial Settlement of their respective Districts, as also such other accounts and information not already furnished as may be necessary. May 14; No. 63.

2305. Letter from Collector of Dacca, stating that the Tálukdárs dependent on Dakshín Sháhbázpur have sold their estates rather than be separated from the Zamíndárs, and requesting orders thereon. February 28; No. 33.

2306. Letter to Collector of Dacca, stating that the Board have no objection to the Tálukdárs' sale of their lands to the Zamíndárs, but desire him to take engagements from the latter for the lands purchased. May 4; No. 34.

2307. Letter from Collector of Dacca, reporting his having continued the separable Táluks under the management of the Zamíndárs, in consequence of the non-attendance of Tálukdárs. May 5; No. 16.

2308. Letter to Collector of Dacca, desiring him to submit a list of the Tálukdárs who have omitted to attend for the purpose of concluding their settlements. May 9; No. 7.

2309. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that all leases granted by the Decennial Farmers in Rájsháhí, whose engagements have been set aside, be declared null and void. May 4; No. 25.

2321. Letter from Commissioner at Rájsháhí, submitting a petition and statement from Rájá Rámkrishna, representing his inability to collect balances due to him from the Farmers, and proposing periods to be allowed him for making payment on account of his balances of revenue. May 15; No. 13.

2322. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí, informing him of a payment made by the Rájá on account of his balances, and of the consequent suspension of the sale of his lands. May 28.

2323. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting his having confined the Rájá, and stating that he will prepare and submit a statement of the rent (Jamá) of lands proposed to be sold in liquidation of his balances. May 18; No. 6.

2324. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, stating that he has nearly realized the balance due from the Rájá, and that the remainder will be received in a few days. May 23; No. 25.

2325. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, suggesting that the lands recommended for sale to liquidate balance of revenue due from the Rájá may be sold to meet the demands of Rájás Dal Chánd and Húzurí Mal. May 25; No. 2.

2326. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, informing him of an order issued to Preparer of Reports relative to disposing of the Rájá's lands, and desiring him to submit a statement of the rent (Jamá) assessed on the said lands. May 28.

2327. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, reporting that the Zamíndár of Bírbhúm has liquidated his balance on account of year 1198, exclusive of suspensions, and he hopes soon to realize the small balance due from him for former years; also enclosing a petition from the Zamíndár, requesting a few days' indulgence for payment of the amount still due from him. May 25; No. 8.

2328. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, informing him that the sale of the Rájá's lands has been suspended, and directing him to fix an early period for the discharge of the balance. May 28.

2329. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, respecting balances due from Mahals held immediately under Government management (khás), and those of disqualified Landholders; representing the inconvenience and disadvantages of the khás system; will suggest mode for the better securing the revenue assessed on lands of minor and female proprietors; also submitting an advertisement issued in consequence of desertion of managers owing to their being pressed for payment of revenue. May 15; No. 7.

Bishnupur balance, but relies upon the exertions of the managers for recovery of the balance outstanding in the Mufassal. May 1; No. 15.

2340. Letter from Collector of Behar, reporting on the measures taken to secure balance due from Mukarrarídár of Sandá Baliá. June 11; No. 8.

2341. Letter to Collector of Behar, approving of measures adopted for securing the revenues due from Sandá Baliá, and directing him, in the event of any balance remaining due at the end of the year, to submit a statement of lands to be sold in liquidation thereof. June 20.

2342. Letter from Collector of Behar, in reply to orders for the transmission of his account settlement, stating the difficulties which have impeded the settlement, and regarding the arrangement of Mahals. June 13; No. 25.

2343. Letter to Collector of Behar, requiring terms of the settlement proposed to be concluded with the Zamíndárs of Sarishá and Kutumbá; and also information on the subject of the unadjusted claims on this Zamíndár; adding that the Board will hereafter give instructions as to the mode of arranging Mahals. June 27; No. 26.

2344. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting having realized the whole of the balance of 1197 due from the Rájá of Bardwán. June 10; No. 31.

2345. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting a petition from the Rájá, requiring one month to prepare the Settlement Statement (Jamábandí) papers of Parganá Azmatsháhí, advertised for sale. June 27; No. 8.

2346. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, desiring him immediately to forward statement of the rent (Jamá) of Azmatsháhí, and to acquaint the Rájá that the Board cannot admit of any delay in the delivery of the remaining statements so repeatedly required from him. January 29; No. 11.

2347. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, directing him to advertise the sale of the lands of Masaúd Khán for the liquidation of balances, for one month, and after that time to dispose of the lands at the rent (Jamá) fixed. June 1.

2348. Letter from Governor-General in Council, authorizing the adoption of the Acting President's proposition respecting the recovery of future advances of Takávi. May 25; No. 16.

propriation of the fine inflicted on Rájá Bikramárjit Sinh to the relief of the sufferers. June 5; No. 14. Answered, June 25.

2359. Letter to Collector of Silhet, transmitting him an extract from a letter from Council relative to lands in Bázu Jetwá, formerly held by the Khasiás, with copy of the Board's address to Council on the subject, and directing him, previous to selling the lands, to advertise the sale of them at his court. June 19.

2360. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, transmitting statements of lands of several proprietors to be sold on account of balances of 1198. June 6; No. 17.

2361. Letter from Commissioner at Rájsháhí, submitting letters from Rájá Rámkrishna, representing the impossibility of collecting his rents under the existing regulations, and soliciting authority to continue his former mode of coercion. June 23; No. 18.

2362. Letter to Collector of Behar, authorizing him to put Rájá Náráyan Sinh in management of his Zamíndárí (Sarishá and Kutumbá) as soon as it may appear expedient, and directing him to submit the proposed settlement for this Parganá with the least possible delay. June 29; No. 22.

2363. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, stating that, in consequence of the Tálukdár of Sádipur having refused to execute his engagements, he has let the Táluk in farm for ten years to Rájá Rámkrishna on the stated terms. June 15; No. 27.

## JULY, 1792.

2364. Petition from Prán Krishna Sinh, representing that Rájá Dámodar Sinh has dispossessed him of his Mahattrán lands, or lands assigned for religious purposes, in Bishnupur, and begging redress. July 4; No. 36.

2365. Petition from Vakíl of Subal Dás, stating that the Rájá of Bardwán has discharged part of the debt due to Húzurí Mal and Dal Chánd, and is entering into engagements for a loan to pay the remainder, and therefore he hopes the Board will suspend the sale of the Rájá's lands. July 23; No. 29.

2366. Letter to Collector of Behar, transmitting him instructions respecting the boundary line of the Bhágalpur and Behar Collectorships, and regarding annexations and separations to take place from commencement of 1200. July 4.

2367. Letter to Collector of Behar, authorizing him to make Takáví

Táluks in Shaistánagur who had absconded, be let in farm to the proprietor of that Mahal; approving of Takáví advances authorized in villages of Ghyáspur, etc. July 13; No. 35.

2378. Letter from Governor-General in Council, desiring that the balances due from the Zamíndár of Mandalghát be remitted, upon his making over that Parganá to Government; authorizing the Collector of Bardwan's proposition respecting Mandalghát, but directing that the Collector do not grant any of the proposed leases (Pattás) until he shall have completed his inquiries. July 13; No. 3.

2379. Letter to Collector of Jessor, stating that in all cases where he may find it necessary to depute Amíns on account of investigations into miscellaneous rent-free lands (Bází Zamín), the expense must be defrayed by the institutor of the suit. July 18; No. 16.

2380. Letter from Collector of Jessor, submitting statement of suspensions granted in consideration of the calamities of the season, and the mode adopted for ascertaining the amount to which the several Landholders were entitled on this account. June 10; No. 18.

2381. Letters from Collector of Jessor, submitting statement of balances due in his District on account of 1197 and 1198, and of such lands as can best be sold in liquidation thereof. June 15, No. 27; and June 29, No. 30.

2382. Letter to Collector of Jessor, with instructions regarding the collection of balances due. July 20; No. 31.

2383. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, transmitting account sales of lands of contumacious Landholders. July 28; No. 10.

2384. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, directing him to put Rájá Naba Krishna in possession of the Táluk of Baliá, with the exception of the rent-free (Bází Zamín) lands claimed. July 16.

2385. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, informing him of order to the Preparer of Reports to sell lands of Ramsundar Rái, Jairám Rái, and Darpanáráyan for liquidation of balances. July 2.

2386. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, transmitting him copy of letter to Council regarding Settlement of sundry Mahals in his District, and reply thereto. July 2.

2387. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, reporting on the claim of Rájá Iswar Chandra Rái to the Khás portion of Parganá Calcutta. July 3; No. 21.

Reports being directed to suspend sale of the Rájá's lands. July 30.

2399. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, submitting petition from the son of late proprietor of Jairámbátí, representing the distressed state of his Táluk, in consequence of its being over-assessed, and requesting to be allowed an abatement. July 3; No. 10.

2400. Letter to Collector of Sháhábád, sanctioning the mode proposed for discharging the balance due from Rájá Bikramárjit Sinh, and directing him not to annul any of the leases granted by the Rájá without previous reference to the Board. July 25; No. 16.

## AUGUST, 1792.

2401. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, transmitting a representation from the Manager for the Joint Zamíndárs of Bishnupur, relative to the charge entrusted to him, with his remarks thereon. July 30; No. 13.

2402. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, in reply, stating that the Board is of opinion that all the lands paying the full assessment under the Khás Settlement of 1196 ought to continue to pay agreeably thereto, stating the mode of recovering the assessments underrated, and adding that the Board consider all lands not exempted from payment of revenue liable to the full rates of assessment. July 3; No. 15.

2403. Letters from Collector of Bírbhúm, regarding the objections of the Zamíndárs of Bishnupur to sign engagements (Kabúliyats), and respecting the assessment of Bishnupur District. May 4, No. 23; and June 19, No. 26. Answered, August 10; No. 27.

2404. Letter from Collector of Behar, requiring information respecting Bahádur Sinh's claims on account of Mufassal balances, also relative to those of his Mukarrarí villages which are over-assessed; submitting proceedings on requisition made to Bahádur Sinh to engage for his lands, and his observations on the cause of his declining; also reporting the distressed condition of Mukarrarídárs in Nirhát Jamai. July 5; No. 4.

2405. Letter to Collector of Behar, approving of his having advertised for proposals for farming villages belonging to Bahádur Sinh, and desiring him to report the result, and the amount of abatement of assessment necessary; also to submit result of the Tahsíldárs'

2412. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, transmitting copy of letter from the Rájá, stating that the rayats of his Zamíndárí have no resources left to admit of their paying their rents, and requesting a person to be appointed to receive collections; informing the Board of his having rejected the above request, remarking on the favourable state of the season in most parts of the Zamíndárí, and commenting on the duplicity of the Rájá. August 21; No. 12.

2413. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, concurring in his sentiments on the subject of the Rájá's petition, and approving his having rejected his request. August 27; No. 15.

2414. Letter from Collector of Calcutta, requesting instructions regarding the refusal of Mr. Charles Weston, the present proprietor of Tiretta's Bázár, to pay the ground rent and police tax (Chaukídárí) of the land occupied by the Bázár, and enclosing copy of the lease (Pattá) under which Mr. Tiretta held the Bázár. July 21; No. 15.

2415. Letter to Collector of Calcutta in reply, desiring him to call on Mr. Weston for payment of the amount of taxes due, and to inform him that, in case of his non-compliance, the Board will direct the sequestration of the Bázár collections. August 10; No. 17.

2416. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting letter from the Collector of Calcutta, and recommending, for the reasons there stated, that the District be continued under direct Government management (khás) during the current year. August 8; No. 16. Answered, August 17, No. 11, directing that Calcutta be held khás for the current year.

2417. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting extract of proceedings relative to late drought and inundation in the District of Hijili, with a recommendation that the sums suspended in Hijili and Jaleswar be admitted. August 22; No. 14.

2418. Letter from Collector of Jessor, with a question relative to the rights of a Tálukdár to be separated from the authority of a Zamíndár, where the title-deed stipulates that the former is to pay his revenue through the latter, and another person purchases a portion of this Táluk without any such stipulation. August 8; No. 6. Answered, August 13; No. 7.

2419. Letter from Collector of Jessor, reporting that the proprietors through whose lands the proposed Canal is to be cut have

## SEPTEMBER, 1792.

2428. Letter to Collector of Behar, transmitting orders from Council for the Mukarraridár of Sanda Baliá to be dispossessed, and the Settlement to be concluded with the actual proprietors of the lands; also for an annual pension to be granted to the Mukarraridár, and the balance due from him to be written off. September 24.

2429. Letter from Collector of Behar, reporting having carried into execution the instructions respecting the boundary between the Bhágalpur and the Behar Districts. August 20; No. 11.

2430. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, directing him to release Seríkánt Bánarji, the late Zamíndár of Mandalghát, from confinement. September 10.

2431. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them copies of Regulation vesting Landholders and Farmers with a power of distraining and selling property of their under-renters for realizing arrears of revenue. September 21.

2432. Letter from Collector of Dacca, reporting amount of balance due from Parganá Idalpur, and the measures taken by him in consequence. September 4; No. 17.

2433. Letter to Collector of Dacca, approving of his having deputed a Tahsíldár to the Idalpur Parganá; desiring him to call on the proprietors to appoint a manager, and in event of the balance not being discharged by the end of the year, to submit a statement of lands to be sold. September 12; No. 18.

2434. Letter to Collector of Dacca, transmitting letter from Sub-Secretary to Government, with directions to submit a statement of lands of Pitámbar Sen to be sold for the purpose of discharging the amount of the decree passed against him in favour of Mír Sayyid Arab. September 26.

2435. Letter to Collector of Jessor, stating that the Board, previous to passing orders regarding the farming of Karoliá and Mathurápur, desire him to acquaint the Zamíndárs of Mahmúdsháhí that they will be allowed one month for instituting their claims to these Mahals. September 14; No. 9.

2436. Letter from Collector of Jessor, informing of his having deputed a Sazáwal to take charge of Táighari in order to balance the account of the past and present years. September 20; No. 19.

2447. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, submitting a letter from the Hijili Agent, reporting that he has disposed of Dihís Tikrá and Bharganj for liquidation of balances due from the Zamíndár. August 10; No. 33.

2448. Letter from Collector of Salt Districts, submitting a letter from the Hijili Agent requesting sanction to the re-sale of Bharganj in the event of the purchaser not making good his payment within the prescribed time. August 29; No. 34.

2449. Letter to Collector of Salt Districts, directing him to instruct the Hijili Agent to sell Dihí Bharganj at the time proposed, whether the late purchaser tendered the purchase-money or not. September 5.

2450. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, reporting on the effects of the late drought and over-assessment of the District; also respecting outstanding balances, and suggesting the necessity of a permanent abatement from the amount of Settlement. August 23; No. 11. Answered, September 24; No. 22.

2451. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, submitting a petition from Chaudhrí Púrba Sinh, proprietor of a part of Khidirpur in Parganá Kasmár, requesting remission from his Jamá on account of the loss which his estate has sustained by the encroachments of the Ganges, and submitting his opinion thereon. August 11; No. 37.

2452. Letter to Collector of Tirhut in reply, directing him to depute an Amín to investigate the losses complained of by Chaudhrí Púrba Sinh. September 17.

2453. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, reporting on balances due from Dandrá Alláhábád for 1196 and 1197, and stating the claims of the Zamíndárs to monthly allowance (Musháhará) for the year their lands were held under Government management (khas), and also informing that the Zamíndárs propose to pay the balance in two months by instalments. June 28; No. 4.

2454. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, authorizing him to release the proprietors of Dandrá Alláhábád, on their engaging to pay balances due. September 17; No. 5.

2455. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, representing that the deputies (Náibs) of the Zamíndár of Gangámandal have declined entering into engagements, and that he has in consequence called for proposals for farming the Parganá. June 18; No. 19.

2456. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, transmitting him orders and

remarks on the Settlement of his District. September 17; No. 13.

2457. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a petition from Sundar Náráyan, late Zamíndár of three-sixteenths or three annas division of Kutabpur, sold by the Sheriff in satisfaction of debts due to Mr. H. Baillie. September 5; No. 9.

2458. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Tirhut, and recommending the adoption of his suggestion that the service (Nánkár) lands of the absconded proprietors be sold for discharge of arrears. September 12; No. 11.

## OCTOBER, 1792.

2459. Letter from Collector of Behar, submitting an account of the principal Zamíndárs, and suggesting the expediency of granting deductions in Ghyáspur, Behar, Marhát, etc., after ascertaining the over-assessment of them. July 2; No. 12.

2460. Letter to Collector of Behar, stating that the Board do not deem it expedient to authorize any revision of the assessment of the Parganás mentioned. October 3; No. 13.

2461. Letter from Collector of Behar, replying to the objections of the Collector of Bhágalpur to the adoption of the boundary line between his District and that of Behar proper. October 4; No. 14.

2462. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, submitting report on losses caused by the inundation. October 5; No. 17.

2463. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, stating that Báránasi Ghosh has refunded the sum granted to him as a suspension, and has likewise paid the fine imposed on him. October 2; No. 5.

2464. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, reporting that Rájá Bikramárjit Sinh, Zamíndár of Bhojpur, has paid his balances of revenue on account of 1199 by means of a loan, to raise which he mortgaged his Zamíndárí and monthly allowance, and recommending that the Rájá be restored to the management of his lands. September 15; No. 11.

2465. Letter to Collector of Sháhábád, approving of engagements entered into by Rájá Bikramárjit Sinh for the purpose of enabling him to pay his balances, but adding that the Board cannot acquiesce in the suggestion that the Rájá be restored

to possession, or that he be considered a disqualified Land-holder. October 12; No. 13.

2466. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, reporting on the assessment of Táluk Bara Manirámpur. September 11; No. 16.

2467. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, stating that the Board deem the Tálukdár of Bara Manirámpur responsible for the Jamá paid by him for the period of eight years, and desiring him therefore to call upon him to enter into engagements for this Jamá, and in the event of his refusing, to advertise for proposals to farm his lands. October 31; No. 19.

2468. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting correspondence with the Collector of Maimansinh on the subject of the claim of the Zamíndár of Hazrádí for compensation in consequence of the separation of Tálukdárs, and requesting orders thereon. October 5; No. 2.

2469. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting letter from Collector of Salt Districts regarding the mode and periods proposed for recovery of suspensions in Hijili. October 15; No. 16.

2470. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a statement of the gross land revenue (Jamá) of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, with an explanatory report drawn out by the Acting Secretary; also subjoining an account of sundry charges hitherto borne by the Zamíndárs, but now brought into the total revenue charges (Sadr Jamá). October 31; No. 32.

## NOVEMBER, 1792.

2471. Letter to Acting President, requesting him to issue a warrant in the name of the Názír, directing him to apprehend the Zamíndár of Torá and send him to the Collector of Tipperah. November 23.

2472. Petition from Rájá Nabakrishna, requesting the payment of his monthly allowance (Musháhará) on account of Parganás Gangámandal, Asimpur, etc., for the year 1198. November 5; No. 17.

2473. Petition from Rájá Nabakrishna, requesting an order to the Collector of Nadiyá to deduct from his stipulated rent (Táhud) the amount of revenue for ground sold to Government. November 28; No. 38.

2474. Petition from rayats of Azímábád in 24 Parganás, representing oppressions exercised over them by the Náibs of the purchasers of several Táluks in the said Parganá, and begging redress. November 30; No. 27.

2475. Letter from Collector of Behar, reporting that Rájá Náráyan Sinh has agreed to enter into engagements for his lands at the assessment (Jamá) proposed; submitting result of inquiries into tenures of villages belonging to petty Landholders, with information regarding disputed villages, and proposals for farming them. October 25; No. 3.

2476. Letter to Collector of Behar, approving the Settlement concluded with Rájá Náráyan Sinh, and also the Settlement of the villages belonging to petty Zamíndárs. November 14; No. 7.

2477. Letter to Collector of Behar, desiring him to strike out the village of Dasarathpur from the revenue (Jamá) of his District, and to declare it rent-free. November 19.

2478. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, submitting propositions of the Zamíndárs of the Behar division of his District for payment of the amount of suspensions on the last year's assessment. November 9. Agreed, November 28.

2479. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, submitting a letter regarding a robbery committed in the Zamíndárí of Baidyanath. November 28.

2480. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting on the request of Munshí Sadr-ud-dín to pay the revenue of Mauzá Bara Káliápur, in Parganá Sháh Salímpur, into the Bardwán treasury. November 2.

2481. Letter to Collector of Bardwán in reply, transmitting copy of a letter from the Collector of Murshidábád, with directions to ascertain and report if Mauzá Bara Káliápur is situated in Parganá Sháh Salímpur. November 2.

2482. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, transmitting him extract of proceedings on the claim of Kripámay Mustafí to Taraf Gaurá in his purchase of Parganá Chitwá. November 23.

2483. Letter from Mr. John Buller, informing the Board of the manner in which he charged the monthly allowance (Musháhará) of the Rájá of Tipperah. November 19.

2484. Letter to Collector of Calcutta, approving of his having confined the Ihtimámdárs of Arkuli and Sutánati. November 23.

2485. Letter from Collector of Calcutta, submitting result of inquiries

regarding the boundaries of ground lately purchased by Government for a Musalmán burying-place. November 26.

2486. Letter from Collector of Calcutta, informing of an abatement from the assessed revenue (Jamábandí) of Panchánnagáon on account of the assessment of ground purchased by Government for a Musalmán burying-place. November 26.

2487. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, returning, with instructions, register of rent-free lands of Muhammad Husain's share of Sandwíp. November 21.

2488. Letter from Commissioner at Kuch Behar, submitting Account Settlement for nine years of Bodo, Pátgáon, and Rángámáti. November 2.

2489. Letter from Commissioner at Kuch Behar, submitting a letter from the Collector of Rangpur, and reporting his having taken over charge of office from him. November 26.

2490. Letter from Collector of Dacca, recommending that the proposals of the proprietor of Jalálpur Nawárá be accepted, there being no offers for the farming of his lands. November 14.

2491. Letter to Collector of Dacca, requiring a report on the extent of land in Amírábád destroyed by the encroachment of the Ganges, and also directing him to ascertain the quantity of land in possession of the proprietor of Kandar Khán, and requiring him to engage for it. November 16.

2492. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing that the pension hitherto enjoyed by Mír Sayyid Alí be continued to his grandson Mír Ghulám Husain. November 19.

2493. Letter from Collector of Dacca, reporting on the annexation of Dáúdkándí Parganá to Tipperah. November 28.

2494. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, informing him that Council does not think it necessary for him to depute an Assistant to ascertain the extent of sugar-cane cultivation, but desiring him to furnish the best information he can procure from his own inquiries. November 19.

2495. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, transmitting copy of a decree passed by the Judge of the Díwání Adálat on the claim of Prán Náth Chakravartti to a one-fourth or 4 annas share of Uláhul in Parganá Sálbárís. November 28.

2496. Letter from Governor-General in Council, confirming an amended Tahsíldárí for Behar; agreeing to deputation of Mr. Hesilrige to make measurements and assessment (Jamábandí) of the

regarding the settlement of sundry villages, the property of Bahádúr Sinh. November 14; No. 13.

2504. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Purniah, with an application from Mr. Pagan for permission to establish sugar-works and cultivate the cane. November 9; No. 11.

2505. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting question from the Collector of Rangpur regarding rates at which the rupees receivable from Kuch Behar are to be brought to credit. November 9; No. 17.

2506. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that the village of Dasarathpur be struck off the rent-roll (Jamá) of the Behar Collectorship, and declared rent-free; also desiring that the pension hitherto allowed by Mír Said Alí Fazl be continued to his grandson Mír Ghulám Husain, on the condition of his maintaining his female relations. November 19; No. 1.

2507. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting proceedings regarding the application of Messrs. Burgh and Barber for the payment of arrears of monthly allowance (Musháhará) due to the Rájá of Tipperah. November 19; No. 12.

2508. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter and enclosure from the Collector of Nadiyá regarding the exaction of presents (Bátí Salámí) by the French Government from the rayats of Pallará in Boro. November 23; No. 3.

2509. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from the Collector of Nadiyá respecting the application of the Tálukdárs of Parganá Boro for suspension of the demands of Government upon them equal to their claims on the French, with the Board's recommendation thereon; also requesting orders respecting mode of securing the regular payment in future of the revenues demandable from the French. November 23; No. 28.

2510. Letter from Governor-General in Council, authorizing restoration of the Zamíndárs in Purniah to the exercise of their functions as Kánúngos; also approving of the annexation of Táluk Jaipur to the Jessor Collectorship. November 16; No. 2.

2511. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, submitting answers from the proprietors of Kásijorá, Nárájol, and Midnapur, on the subject of the Settlement; replying to the Board's strictures upon his conduct in respect to former answer transmitted from Zamíndár of Kásijorá. November 5; No. 18.

request for an order to cut the crops of the Khimat (?) lands on the ground. October 27; No. 16.

2522. Letter to Collector of Tirhut, directing him to require Rájá Madhu Sinh to enter into engagements for his Khimat (?) lands at the rent (Jamá) proposed; approving of the reply given to the Rájá's request respecting the crops on the ground, and remarking on the facility with which he may collect the revenue of the said lands. November 16; No. 19.

2523. Letter from late Collector of Tipperah, reporting that Tipperah proper has been divided into small portions, and the Settlement concluded with the farmers; reporting on the cause of dispossessing the late Zamíndár, and the allowance granted for the maintenance of his family. December 24, 1791; No. 10.

2524. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, reporting having deputed an Amín to attach the property of the proprietors of 2.11. Sugdi and 2.8.2 Torá, who have absconded in balance. November 17; No. 34.

2525. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, approving of measures adopted by him with regard to property of absconded proprietors. November 23.

2526. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, stating that the Board had taken measures for the apprehension of the Zamíndár of Torá, who, if apprehended, would be at once sent to him. November 23; No. 55.

2527. Letter to Collector of Behar, authorizing the acceptance of the terms offered for the villages of Bahádur Sinh. November 28.

2528. Letter to Collector of Behar, confirming the Settlement concluded for villages of petty Zamíndárs of Sarishá and Kutumbá, and authorizing acceptance of proposals of Gangá Sáhái for farming the 54 disputed villages for one year. November 28.

2529. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, stating that the Board observe with much concern the heavy balance due by the Rájá, and approve his intention of confining him. November 23; No. 40.

2530. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, transmitting petition from Rájá Nabakrishna, with directions to state what abatement from the revenue now paid by the Rájá would be necessary. November 28.

balances of last year, and authorizing him to accept the terms offered for the remaining years of the Decennial Settlement. December 10; No. 7.

2540. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, transmitting declaration in writing of independent Tálukdárs who have refused to execute engagements for the Decennial Settlement, accompanied with a specification of the assessment of their Táluks. November 28; No. 9.

2541. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, submitting a detailed explanation of circumstances relative to the Midnapur Decennial Settlement, in exculpation of the charge of disobedience of orders. December 15; No. 19.

2542. Letter to Collector of Maimansinh, informing him that the Governor-General has expressed satisfaction with his diligence and attention in enforcing the delivery of leases (Pattás). December 5.

2543. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, submitting the result of inquiries into assets of Táluk Jairámbátí, and recommending that it be let in farm for the remaining period of the Decennial Settlement. November 6; No. 14.

2544. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, authorizing him to advertise for proposals for farming Táluk Jairámbátí. December 5; No. 15.

2545. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, authorizing him to suspend the demands of Government on the Tálukdárs of Bhabánípur, etc., to the extent of their claims on the French. December 10.

2546. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, reporting on Indigo Factories erected in his District, and the misconduct of some persons engaged therein. December 1; No. 13.

2547. Letter to Collector of Tirhut in reply, directing him to prohibit the erection of Indigo Factories without the authority of Government, and desiring him to report what number of Europeans in his District are at present in possession of Indigo Factories, and who of them have the permission of Government. December 24; No. 14.

2548. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, informing him that the Collector of Dacca has been instructed to deliver over charge of Dáúdkándi to him at the end of the current year. December 10.

2549. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, transmitting him instructions to dispossess Muhammad Alí of any lands that may be held by

bear a just proportion to the total assessed revenue (Sadr Jamá) of the estate. January 14.

2562. Letter from Collector of Behar, submitting the expediency of being authorized to divide out and grant leases (Pattás) for garden (Bárí) land, contiguous to Gayá, to such persons as will engage to raise plantations. December 24; No. 8.

2563. Letter to Collector of Behar, desiring him to state upon what grounds he has ascertained that the land referred to in the foregoing is the immediate property of Government. January 23; No. 9.

2564. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, stating that Kálí Prasád Rái, the surety of Parganás Indrání and Báhirgarh, confined on account of balances due from these Parganás for 1197, proposes to liquidate the amount by instalments, provided he is set at liberty. January 15; No. 13.

2565. Letter to Collector of Bardwán in reply, directing him to ascertain if Kálí Prasád Rái is able to procure a responsible security (Málzámin) for the due payment of the balance at the periods proposed. January 21; No. 15.

2566. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting copies of Regulations for the Mints, and of the tables of rates of exchange (Báttá), with directicns to distribute them for general information. January 21.

2567. Circular Letter to Collectors, communicating proposition of the Board to the Council, and approved of, recommending that the amount of proceeds of sales by the Sheriff should in future be kept in deposit for the discharge of arrears due to Government, previous to being appropriated to any other purpose; and desiring that they will in future, upon receipt of orders to give possession of lands disposed of by the Sheriff, also submit a statement of any arrears that may be due. January 28.

2568. Letter from Governor-General in Council, with instructions respecting the resumption of Jágír lands held by the late Muhammad Rezá Khán. December 21; No. 6.

2569. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting a letter from the Collector of Nadiyá, with an application from Mr. J. Fletcher to farm lands in order to erect Indigo Works. January 9; No. 7a.

2570. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting a letter from Messrs. Baretto on the subject of an application made to the

2580. Letter from Collector of Jessor, transmitting a petition from the Tálukdár of Ichapur, requesting the transfer of revenues of Kismats Narkoná and Dámodarí from Dacca to Jessor. January 4; No. 7.

2581. Letter from Collector of Jessor in reply, regarding unauthorized exchange (Báttá) in Mahmúdsháhí, alluded to in former letter. January 7; No. 17.

2582. Letter to Collector of Jessor, transmitting copy of a letter from Sub-Secretary to Government, with directions to submit the information required respecting exchange (Báttá) levied on the revenues of Mahmúdsháhí. January 23.

2583. Letter from Collector of Jessor, submitting a statement of lands belonging to Syám Lál Rái and Mati Lál Rái, proposed to be sold in liquidation of decrees passed against them. December 10, 1792; No. 21. Answered, January 23, directing him to sell such portion of the lands as may be necessary to discharge the decree.

2584. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, submitting certain circumstances which have come to his knowledge during a visit to Kásijorá and Sháhpur relative to the Settlement; stating the measures he had taken to secure the revenues of the current year; enclosing Mufassal statement of the rent (Jamá) of these estates (Mahals) for 1196; retracting his opinion, delivered in his letter of December 10, respecting the future assessment of Kásijorá and Sháhpur; reporting that the Rájá is willing to engage for the assessment fixed, provided he be not considered responsible for arrears; and also reporting that he has concluded the Settlement of the lands of Subal Dás. December 29; No. 1.

2585. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting upon a petition presented to him by Hari Náráyan Gosáin, relative to the village of Pálpárá, claimed by him by right of purchase. December 17; No. 18. Answered, January 11, No. 20, stating that the Board is of opinion that Hari Náráyan Gosáin should be allowed to retain Pálpárá.

2586. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, submitting proposals from Narahari Chaudhrí for farming Tappá Nárájol, with his remarks on the terms offered. January 11; No. 6.

2587. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, transmitting orders of Council respecting the Settlement of Kásijorá. January 21.

for Mauzá Chandí and Harishpur to be separated from his District and annexed to Bhágalpur at the expiration of the current year. January 21.

2598. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, informing of his having nominated officers to co-operate with the Rájá's officers in making measurement, also mentioning his having judged it advisable not to inform the Rájá of the extension of the period for his granting leases (Pattás). December 27; No. 2. Replied to, January 9; No. 3.

2599. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, submitting a petition on the part of the Farmers and Securities (Málzámins) of 1197, repeating their inability to produce the papers required of them, and setting forth the hardships they will sustain by being longer detained and confined. January 10; No. 20. Answered, January 14, informing of the foregoing having been submitted to Council.

2600. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, relative to the Settlement of the lands of the Mukarrarídár of Pawará, transmitting detail of the Settlement (Bandobast) and account claims of the Kánúngos and daily allowance holders (Rozínádárs) heretofore paid by the Mukarrarídár. December 30; No. 6.

2601. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, with directions to deliver over charge of the District to Mr. Lumsden immediately upon his arrival, and then repair to Calcutta. January 7.

2602. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, regarding the distribution of the assessment on the lands proposed to be sold. November 22; No. 8.

2603. Letter to Collector of Tirhut, transmitting instructions from Council for the resumption of the Jágír of the late Muhammad Rezá Khán. January 2; No. 7.

2604. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, submitting a petition from sundry proprietors of villages encroached upon by the Ganges, representing their distressed situation. December 14; No. 4.

2605. Letter to Collector of Tirhut in reply, desiring his opinion on the expediency of a deputation for the purposes requested by the petitioners; and in the event of a deputation being ultimately authorized, to instruct the officer to ascertain by whom the land which was carried away was acquired; also desiring him to observe it as a rule in future to give his opinion with every petition he may submit. January 23; No. 6.

2616. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur, directing him to report when the Takáví balance shall have been recovered. February 11.

2617. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, transmitting copy of a letter from Council relative to repairs of the embankments (Puls) in Mandalghát. February 1.

2618. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, sanctioning compliance with Mr. R. Chapman's application for permission to rent ground in Parganá Bagri in order to erect Indigo Works. February 1.

2619. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, informing him of an order from Council for annexing Bishnupur to his Collectorship. February 8.

2620. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting that Kálí Prasád Rái cannot procure a responsible security (Zámin) for the due payment of his balances at the period proposed. February 20; No. 26.

2621. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, informing of Gaurhari Ghosh having offered proposals for the discharge of his balances due to Government by instalments, on giving security, and recommending that he be released from confinement in consequence. February 20; No. 27.

2622. Letter to Collector of Bardwán in reply, directing him, previous to enlarging Gaurhari Ghosh, to inform the Board whether he has any property, and also whether he can procure a responsible surety (Málzámin). February 25; No. 27.

2623. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, enclosing translation of a petition from Ghulám in the District of Islámábád, and recommending that an Amín be deputed to investigate the truth of the statements set forth in the petition. February 10; No. 54.

2624. Letter to Collector of Chittagong in reply, directing him not to depute an Amín, but to continue the Zamíndár in confinement. February 20; No. 26.

2625. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting an extract of a letter from Council regarding rates of exchange (Báttá). February 1.

2626. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting para. of a letter from Council desiring they will point out any separations or annexations that may be necessary to render their Districts compact. February 8; No. 5.

2627. Letter to Commissioner at Kuch Behar, transmitting copy of a letter to Council, with answer thereto, respecting the rate at

2638. Letter from Acting Collector of Midnapur, submitting proposals for farming the lands of Rámdulál, Hari Krishna Bánarji, and Mánikrám; also a statement of the remissions from the rent (Jamá) required by said persons, and recommending that the Táluk of Rámlochan be held under Government management (khás) at the present rent (Jamá). January 12; No. 6.

2639. Letter to Acting Collector of Midnapur, desiring him to hold under Government management (khás) the Táluks mentioned in the foregoing, and directing him in future, when submitting offers of Settlement, to state the consequent abatement from the assessment of 1196. February 1; No. 11.

2640. Letter to Acting Collector of Midnapur, approving the steps taken by him for suppressing disturbances in Parganá Nayábasán. February 4.

2641. Letter from Acting Collector of Midnapur, stating that the person who proposed to farm the lands of Krishna Charan Cháttarji has agreed to the qualification respecting payment of the amount suspended, and has accordingly signed engagements. February 11; No. 14.

2642. Letter from Acting Collector of Midnapur, reporting that Narhari Chaudhrí has refused to farm Nárájol on the conditions required, stating that the proposals of this person were the most advantageous of any offered, and informing of the periods in which he will engage to pay the amount suspended. February 9; No. 16.

2643. Letter to Collector of Maimansinh, transmitting copy of a letter from Council, and petitions of Sudhárám Sarmá and Har Náth Sarmá, with directions to investigate without delay the claims of the petitioners to separation, and to submit his proceedings thereon. February 6.

2644. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, informing him that the Council authorizes an advance of Takávi for cultivation of the sugar-cane in his District, and desiring him to submit an estimate of the amount necessary for the purpose. February 1.

2645. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, authorizing a grant of land to Mr. Fletcher for the purpose of erecting Indigo Works. February 1.

2646. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, stating that the Council intends to adopt measures for the recovery of the accumulated arrears due from the French on account of Ganj Shekerábád. February 1.

2647. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, informing him of annexations to

abatement in the Decennial Settlement of Chainpur and Sasserám. January 5; No. 27.

2660. Letter from late Collector of Sarkár Sáran, reporting the result of investigation respecting deficiency of assets in Bechu Rái and Sardár Rái's Mahals, and suggesting the propriety of relinquishing the balance. December 15, 1792; No. 9.

2661. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, submitting a statement of service (Nánkár) lands belonging to Bhik Dhári Sinh, to be sold for liquidation of balance of the revenue for 1199. January 16; No. 8.

2662. Letter to Collector of Tirhut, transmitting orders from Council regarding annexations to be made to his District from Bhágalpur. February 8.

2663. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, authorizing him to advance to the managers (Sarbaráhkárs) of Bardákhát Takávi advances, not exceeding 5 per cent. on the rent paid (Jamá). February 18.

2664. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, submitting a detailed statement of the Tahsíldári establishment proposed for collecting the rents from the separated Tálukdárs of Phitkárá. January 18; No. 27.

2665. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, submitting further information respecting the claim of Rájá Rám Krishna to certain villages in Parganá Rájipur. February 18; No. 30.

2666. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, recommending a Takávi advance at the rate of Rs. 8 or Rs. 10 per bighá for cultivating the sugar-cane. February 20; No. 5.

2667. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, enclosing a representation from Gokul Náth and Ṇaba Krishna Rái on the Board's orders of the 19th November last, relative to the division of property of the deceased Ráni of Idrakpur among the three sharers; also the proposition of the manager for payment of the balances due to Government. January 17; No. 10.

2668. Letter to Collector of Rangpur in reply, stating that the Board is averse to allowing time to the proprietors to discharge their dues to Government, and desiring him to submit proposals for an early liquidation. February 22; No. 12.

2678. Letter to Collector of Dacca, transmitting copy of a letter to Council, with information that the Governor-General approves of the proposition therein submitted respecting the Settlement of Maisardi, and directing him to make the necessary inquiries into the conduct of the Sazáwal, and report the result. March 1.

2679. Letter to Hijili Salt Agent, stating that the Settlement with the dispossessed Zamíndárs in his District is to take place from the commencement of the ensuing year. March 1.

2680. Letter to Collector of Jessor, transmitting him copy of a letter to Council, with copy of a letter from Sub-Secretary, approving the propositions contained in the Board's letter respecting the exchange (Báttá) collected in Mahmúdsháhí. March 25.

2681. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, informing him of the annexation of Bháwál and Bánkipur to the Dacca Collectorship. March 1.

2682. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, directing that the Zamíndár of Báhirbánd be allowed further time to complete the delivery of leases (Pattás) in his Zamíndárí. March 1.

2683. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, reporting that Kási Náth Láhuri has entered into written engagements for villages Tagerá and Partipátá. October 27; No. 6.

2684. Letter from Collector of Sáran, reporting on the state of the balances due to Government from Braja Sháh and Dirga Sháh, and also of his having put them in confinement. March 2; No. 7.

2685. Letter to Collector of Sáran, approving his having confined the above persons; and on the failure of the payment of the balance due, directing him to submit a statement of his lands to be sold to discharge the amount. March 15; No. 8.

2686. Letter from Collector of Silhet, enclosing an adjustment of the account of the proprietary allowance (Málikáná) of such Landholders as have not acceded to the management of their Táluks, and recommending that the adjustment of monthly allowance (Musháhará) be deferred till after the determination of the suits in the Díwání Adálat. November 5, 1792; No. 7. Answered, March 8, No. 9, approving of the above propositions.

2687. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, informing him of the Civil Paymaster having been instructed to discharge the moiety of arrears granted to the Rájá of Tipperah. March 1.

2696. Letter to Acting Collector of Midnapur, acknowledging receipt of the above three letters, with directions to attach the property of the Rájá, and to take such measures as may be necessary for the security of the revenues. March 25; No. 11.

2697. Letter to Governor-General in Council, enclosing copy of a letter and enclosure from the Collector of Bardwán, with information that the Board do not consider the Rájá entitled to any alteration of his Decennial engagements. March 13; No. 7.

2698. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting copy of a letter and enclosure from the Commissioner at Rájsháhí, with copy of the Board's answer regarding the confinement of Mahárájá Rám Krishna. March 15; No. 4.

2699. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, enclosing his report of having completed the collections of Bhuluá, and also of having advanced monthly allowance (Musháhará) to the Zamíndár. February 14; No. 14.

2700. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, reporting that the Rájá has entered into engagements, agreeably to the periods prescribed by his Lordship in Council. March 18; No. 15.

2701. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting having nearly realized the instalment of revenue for Paush from the Rájá of Bardwán; enclosing a translation of a petition from the Zamíndár of Chitwá; requiring the Board's orders thereon, and also on the confinement of Durjan Sinh of Táluká Ráipur. February 26; No. 6.

2702. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, with regard to malpractices of the agent (Mukhtár) employed in the management of farms held by women. March 25; No. 16. Answered, same date, No. 17, stating the Board is of opinion that the evils stated therein will correct themselves, and that they are averse to addressing the Governor-General on the subject.

2703. Letter from Acting President, reporting having issued the necessary orders to the Commissioner at Rájsháhí relative to the release from confinement of the Farmers of his District. March 22.

2704. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, informing him of the Acting Preparer of Reports having been instructed to sell such portion of the lands of Mánik Rám Chakrabartti mentioned in the statement accompanying his letter of the 6th December, as is sufficient to discharge a sum due to Government, and a re-sale

the Board's proceedings relative to a claim on Báránasi Ghosh. April 10.

2715. Letter from Collector of Bhágalpur, submitting a statement of Mahals separated, with abstract of their rents (Jamá). March 4; No. 21.

2716. Letter to Collector of Bhágalpur in reply, approving of the above separations. April 17.

2717. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting them a new Code of Regulations for the future management of the invalid Jágírdárs' establishment. April 1.

2718. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, stating his intention to proceed to investigate the claims to rent-free (Lákhiráj) lands in Sandwíp. December 18; No. 21. Answered, April 26, directing him to report whether he has completed the above investigation.

2719. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting that, Báránasi Ghosh having discharged the Rájá's demands, he had released him. April 17.

2720. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting having put the Rájá into confinement on account of his balance to Government, and also transmitting a surgeon's report on the ill state of the Rájá's health. April 23; No. 18.

2721. Letter to Governor-General in Council, suggesting advisability of providing a punishment for persons removing or secreting their property in order to prevent its being attached for arrears due from them. April 1; No. 22.

2722. Letter from Governor-General in Council, intimating the abolition of the office of Preparer of Reports. April 8; No. 6.

2723. Letter from Governor-General in Council, regarding the abolition of Revenue Courts (Mál Adálats); stating it has been resolved to vest the collection of the revenue and the administration of justice in separate offices; also regarding the duty and functions of the Board. March 29; No. 23.

2724. Letter from Collector of Jessor, stating that he finds it impracticable to adjust the rent (Jamá) on the lands held rent free (Bází Zamín), agreeably to the principles laid down in the Regulations. January 11; No. 20.

2725. Letter to Collector of Jessor, in reply, stating that the Board do not think the reasons stated by him are sufficient, and directing him to fix the assessment of all lands of this descrip-

ment with the Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs of Jaleswar, for the remaining period of the Decennial Settlement. April 19; No. 8.

2737. Letter to Governor-General in Council, relative to losses sustained in Hájipur by encroachments of the river, and of the Collector of Tirhut having deputed his Assistant to investigate them. April 22; No. 21.

2738. Letter from Governor-General in Council, regarding grants under fixed rent (Islimrárí). April 12; No. 26.

2739. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving the answer given by the Board to the Commissioner of Rájsháhí's letter regarding the sale of dependent Táluks by the Zamíndár of Rájsháhí. April 19; No. 1.

2740. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, enclosing a petition and statement from the Rájá regarding his claim to remission of balances. April 10; Nos. 15 and 16. Answered, April 17; No. 18.

2741. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, stating that the Rájá had failed in payment of the first instalment to Government, and recommending certain estates (Mahals) to be sold in liquidation of the amount. April 18; No. 9.

2742. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, proposing separation and annexation of sundry Mahals in his District. April 18; No. 14. Answered, April 24; No. 19.

2743. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, enclosing proposed Settlement of Mahals in Hájipur farmed by the late Barkat Ullá Khán. March 1; No. 23. Answered, April 22; No. 24.

2744. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, regarding distribution of leases (Pattás). March 24; No. 22. Answered, April 26; No. 23.

2745. Letter to Commissioner of Rájsháhí, directing him to report the period he may think it advisable to fix for the payment of the Takáví due from the Rájá. April 29.

## MAY, 1793.

2746. Petition from Zamíndárs of Tamluk, requesting payment of monthly allowance (Musháhará). May 1; No. 43.

2747. Petition from Rámnidhi Bánarji, regarding separations and annexations. May 20; No. 18.

2748. Petition from Rájá Rám Krishna, Zamíndár of Rájsháhí, request-

pending be delivered over to the Judges of their respective Districts. May 12.

2760. Letter from Collector of Kuch Behar, respecting annexations and separations. March 10; No. 3.

2761. Letter from Collector of Kuch Behar, regarding Zamíndárí of Karaibárí, recommended by him to be separated. March 10.

2762. Minutes by Mr. C. Chapman, regarding farmers in Bardwán under engagements to Government. May 17 and 22; Nos. 21 and 27.

2763. Letter from Collector of Dacca, regarding annexations. March 16; No. 5.

2764. Letter to Collector of Dacca, directing him to submit a statement of lands the property of the Rájá of Rájsháhí, proposed to be sold, and to specify the rent (Jamá). May 1.

2765. Letter to Collector of Dacca, transmitting advertisement of sale of lands of the Rájá of Rájsháhí, for general information. May 1.

2766. Letter from Collector of Dacca, regarding the Settlement of Maisardí. April 9; No. 45. Answered, May 1, informing him that the Board approve of the terms offered by the Zamíndár for the Settlement of Maisardí.

2767. Letter from Collector of Dacca, submitting a petition from the proprietors of Parganá Rájnagar for an advance of Takáví. April 9; No. 6. Answered, May 10, informing him that the Board do not think proper to acquiesce in the above application.

2768. Letter to Collector of Dacca, transmitting extract of a statement forwarded by the Collector of Maimansinh, and directing him to inform the Board what Mahals specified therein are included in his District, and to report on the expediency of the separations and annexations contained therein. May 17.

2769. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, regarding separations and annexations. April 9; No. 6.

2770. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, forwarding examination papers of Sibnáth Sinh, and reporting his having put him in confinement. April 26; No. 38. Answered, May 1, No. 40, stating that there appears to be no proof to justify the punishment, and directing that he may be released and restored to his official functions.

2771. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, stating that the Collector of

Zamíndár of Yusafpur, that the persons engaged in manufacturing Salt refuse to pay the usual rent for lands on which they manufacture it. December 21, 1792; No. 36.

2781. Letter to Collector of Jessor, informing him that the Collector of Murshidábád has been instructed to deliver over several Mahals to be annexed to his District. May 15.

2782. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, submitting copy of proceedings respecting a deficiency in his Treasury of Rs. 16,535. April —; No. 14. Answered, May 8, No. 16, directing him to attach the property of the Treasurer in order to made good the deficiency.

2783. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, stating that the term of the advertisement regarding Rájá Dámodar Bhanj had expired, without his having delivered himself up. April 30; No. 4. Answered, May 22, directing him to continue the Zamíndárí of Dámodar Bhanj under attachment.

2784. Letters from Collector of Maimansinh, regarding annexations and preparations. March 14; No. 8.

2785. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh, submitting proceedings regarding a claim to separation by the Tálukdárs of Alap Sinh. March 30; No. 13.

2786. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh, submitting a statement of Parganá Husainsháhí, the property of Rájá Rám Krishna of Rájsháhi. May 14; No. 7.

2787. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, transmitting copies of statements of Mahals recommended to be separated from his District and annexed to that of Bírbhúm. May 1.

2788. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, recommending sale of the lands of the proprietor of Kulbáriá, and submitting a collection statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) of the lands. April 29; No. 22.

2789. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, desiring him to report whether any further separations or annexations are necessary in his District. May 24.

2790. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, respecting annexations and separations. February 21; No. 10.

2791. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, approving of the mortgage bond executed by the Rájá of Nadiyá in favour of Messrs. Baretto. May 1.

2792. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, informing him that the Commander-

and also directing him to receive the arrears due of the Mahals ordered to be transferred to Murshidábád and Rájsháhí. May 1; No. 26.

2806. Letter to Commissioner of Rájsháhí, transmitting him the report relative to certain Mahals being separated from his District and annexed to Dacca. May 3.

2807. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, submitting report relative to assessment of separated Tálukdárs. March 11; No. 11. Answered May 8, No. 13, approving the rent (Jamá) proposed in the above report.

2808. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, regarding annexations and separations. February 20; No. 15.

2809. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, reporting relative to the situation of Parganá Balohar. February 24; No. 16.

2810. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, stating that he has made Takávi advances to the manager of 3½ annas share of Fathipur. April 27; No. 28.

2811. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, stating that the Collector of Murshidábád has been instructed to deliver over several Mahals to be annexed to his District. May 15.

2812. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, regarding annexations and separations, stating that he thinks none are necessary in his District. March 11; No. 14.

2813. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, regarding separations and annexations. March 23; No. 19.

2814. Letter to Collector of Sarkár Sáran, approving his having suspended the sale of the lands of Sabat Rái, Krishna Rái, etc., who have entered into engagements to pay the amount of their balances by instalments. May 10; No. 35.

2815. Letter to Collector of Sarkár Sáran, transmitting extract of a letter from Council disapproving of the anticipation of the revenues, and directing him to take such measures as he may think best to abolish the practice. May 10.

2816. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, submitting report on the Decennial Settlement of Sarkár Champáran. May 9; No. 22.

2817. Standing Orders, directing that the Hill Chiefs, etc., under the Bhágalpur and Rájmahal Collectorships be considered in future as being within the jurisdiction of those Districts. May 1.

2818. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, regarding collections from the Jágír of Nawáb Muzaffar Jang. April 4; No. 9.

2831. Letter from Commissioner at Rájsháhí, relative to the annexation of Ambárí to Dinájpur. May 3; No. 4.

2832. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, submitting a petition from the Rájá requesting an extension of the period fixed for the sale of his lands. May 23; No. 18. Answered, May 27, stating that the Board cannot comply with the above requisition.

2833. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting that the rayats of Mandalghát require an immediate Takáví advance of Rs. 5000. May 24; No. 16. Answered, May 27, authorizing the advance as requested.

2834. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm in reply, stating that the Board is of opinion he should not take cognisance of any cases in the Mál Adálat. May 27.

2835. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, authorizing the sale of Parganá Sarúpsinh. May 27.

2836. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, informing him that the sale of the lands in Kulbáriá has been approved of by the Council. May 27.

2837. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, relative to anticipation of revenue by the Agents of Subal Dás. May 29.

2838. Letter from Collector of Dacca, submitting a statement of lands of the Rájá of Rájsháhí proposed to be sold. May 27; No. 9.

2839. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, reporting that he has advertised the sale of Rájá Rám Krishna's lands, and has annexed Parganá Ambárí. May 24; No. 12.

2840. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, suggesting the expediency of taking measures for forcing Jagomohan Mukharji to pay his revenues on account of lands held by him. May 23; No. 14.

## JUNE, 1793.

2841. Letter from late Collector of Behar, submitting copy of his address to Mr. Routledge on the present state of the several Parganás in his District. April 30; No. 16.

2842. Letter from Collector of Behar, submitting particulars of resumed Jágír of the late Muhammad Rezá Khán. April 29; No. 6. Answered, June 7; No. 8.

2843. Letter to Collector of Behar, informing him of Mr. Vanderheyden

2855. Letter from Collector of Calcutta, reporting on the distribution of leases (Pattás). January 11; No. 3.

2856. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, regarding Lákhiráj lands in Sandwíp. May 10; No. 9. Answered, June 17, No. 10, requiring further information on the subject.

2857. Letter from Collector of Kuch Behar, regarding the distribution of leases (Pattás). February 6; No. 11.

2858. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, regarding the distribution of leases (Pattás). January 23; No. 8.

2859. Letter from Collector of Dacca, submitting statement of lands, the property of Rájá Rám Krishna, proposed to be sold. June 15; No. 1.

2860. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of the sale of lands of Rájá of Rájsháhí, and authorizing sale of lands of Durgá Charan Pákrásí. June 7; No. 27.

2861. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting extract of proceedings regarding settlement of monthly allowance (Musháhará) in Midnapur. June 10; No. 8.

2862. Letter from Governor-General in Council, deputing Mr. Vanderheyden to Behar to report on the state of the Settlement. May 31; No. 1.

2863. Letter to Governor-General in Council, respecting assessment of lands belonging to the Rájá of Bardwán proposed to be sold. June 12, No. 22; and June 17, No. 4.

2864. Letter from Governor-General in Council, regarding Settlement of Mahals in Midnapur. June 14; No. 30.

2865. Letter from Governor-General in Council, regarding rent (Jamá) of lands belonging to the Rájá of Bardwán ordered to be sold. June 17; No. 31.

2866. Letter to Collector of Jessor, directing him to submit a statement of lands belonging to the Rájá of Rájsháhí which can best be sold for the purpose of discharging his balances to Government. June 5.

2867. Letter from Collector of Jessor, forwarding a statement of land in his District belonging to the Rájá of Rájsháhí, which he would recommend to be sold. June 14; No. 34.

2868. Letter from Collector of Jessor, reporting on the partition (Batwárá) of Mahmúdsháhí. June 8; No. 21.

2869. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, regarding Settlement of his District. May 7; No. 12.

approve of the measures taken by him regarding the incursions of the Marhattás. June 12.

2885. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, submitting a statement of lands for sale belonging to proprietors in arrears to Government. May 20; No. 17.

2886. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, submitting a petition from the Rájá praying for an abatement in his rent (Jamá), without which the revenues of his Zamíndárí cannot be realized. June 20; No. 5.

2887. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, transmitting extract of proceedings regarding the Settlement of his District. June 17.

2888. Letter from Collector of Behar, reporting that owing to the drought he has limited the advances (Gilandází) to the repairs of such embankments as were necessary for the protection of valuable lands. April 3; No. 21.

2889. Letter from Collector of Behar, regarding the Settlement of lands of Rájá Basant Rám. April 29; No. 30.

2890. Letter from Collector of Behar, submitting list of Jágírs resumed, exclusive of the late Muhammad Rezá Khán's. April 10; No. 23.

2891. Letter from Collector of Behar, submitting a petition from Rájá Fathi Náráyan, praying for an abatement in the rent fixed at the Decennial Settlement on his lands. April 27; No. 28 Answered, June 25, No. 30, declining to comply with th Rájá's request.

2892. Letter to Collector of Behar, requesting him to keep Kur Rán Náráyan in confinement until the arrears of Takáví are di charged. June 28; No. 51.

2893. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, stating the impediments ma by Rájá Tej Chánd regarding the assessment of estates for sa (Hudás). June 21; No. 3.

2894. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, relative to the Ráj Settlement with his renters (Mustágirs). June 20; No. Answered, June 24; No. 6.

2895. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, transmitting a statement lands of Parganá Baliá, the property of the Rájá, to be sol liquidation of arrears due from him. June 28.

2896. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, informing him that Parg Baliá in his District is ordered to be sold on account of arr due to Government. June 28.

2906. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, regarding assessment of the lands to be sold belonging to the Rájá. July 1; No. 10.

2907. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, transmitting instructions respecting the revenue paid by the renters to Government (Sadr Mustájirí Jamá) of lands sold belonging to the Rájá. July 5.

2908. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, relative to Settlement of Mandalghát. May 31; No. 57.

2909. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, relative to balance against Bishnupur. June 30; No. 34. Answered, July 12.

2910. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, approving of the sale of the lands as proposed by him. July 12.

2911. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, relative to lands proposed to be sold, the property of Rájá Tej Chánd. July 16; No. 13. Answered, July 19, No. 15.

2912. Letter to Collector of Chittagong, directing him to take effectual measures for the recovery of such balances in Sandwíp as may be due from estates under the charge of Sazáwals. July 2.

2913. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, submitting statement of lands to be sold, the property of the Zamíndárs of Chittagong and Sandwíp. June 26; No. 41. Answered, July 5, stating that the above statements have been recommended for sanction, and directing him to submit statements of other lands for sale, whose proprietors are in balance.

2914. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting printed copies of the Persian translation of the Proclamation of the 22d March to be distributed amongst the principal landholders of their respective Districts. July 2.

2915. Circular Letters to Collectors, transmitting copy of proposals for opium contracts. July 5.

2916. Circular Letter to Collectors, informing them of the abolition of the Sadr Kánúngos' offices, directing them to instruct the native clerks (Muharrirs) pertaining to that office not to quit their stations till further orders, and informing them that Deeds in future are to be registered in the Courts. July 5.

2917. Circular Letter to Collectors, transmitting a Form enclosed in Collector of Dinájpur's letter, with directions, if they see no objections, to require the landholders to deliver them the records required by the 43d Article in the form now ordered to be communicated to them, and to report how far the land-

holders the increase collected beyond the uniform rent (Jamá) paid by them antecedent to the Decennial Settlement. July 9; No. 16.

2930. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting copy of letter and enclosures from the Collector of Calcutta, recommending that abatements be granted from the assignment fixed in Jamábandí of Panchánnagáon. July 9; No. 25.

2931. Letter to Collector of Jessor, transmitting orders from Council regarding the farming of the villages in Maiháti, agreeably to proposal submitted by Collector on 9th May. July 2.

2932. Letter from Collector of Jessor, relative to the Jamá of Rájá Rám Krishna's lands to be sold. June 23; No. 37.

2933. Letter to Collector of Jessor, transmitting a statement submitted by the Commissioner of Rájsháhí of balances due from separated Tálukdárs, belonging to the Mahals lately separated from Rájsháhí, and informing him that Government authorizes the sale. July 5.

2934. Letter from Collector of Jessor, submitting a statement of lands for sale for arrears to Government on account of the year 1199. June 9; No. 28.

2935. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, relative to the Rájá of Rájsháhí refusing to hold his Punyá. July 11; No. 18. Answered, July 16, No. 19, directing him, in the event of the Rájá falling into arrears, to proceed against him.

2936. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, submitting a statement of the Tahsíldárí establishment of his District, and of the Táluks separated. July 8; No. 61. Answered, July 16, informing him that the Board approve of the above, and desiring him to report at what period the reduction took place.

2937. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, enclosing Rájá's answer to his application to him to hold his Punyá. July 13; No. 35.

2938. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, relative to the several claimants to the Government (khás) Táluks. June 20; No. 23.

2939. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, requesting report relative to lands captured from the French. July 23.

2940. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, submitting a statement of lands, the property of Rám Kumár Chaudhrí to be sold. July 15; No. 48. Answered, July 23, directing him to ascertain if the gross revenue (Jamá) is accurate, and to allot the rent (Jamá) on the lands, agreeably to the Regulations.

2941. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, stating that he has allowed suspensions of balances due from Tálukdárs whose lands are held by the French. March 17; Nos. 35 and 36.

2942. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, transmitting copy of the Sub-Secretary's letter, with copy of Board's letter to Council regarding lands held by the French. July 12.

2943. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, stating that the present proprietors of Digrá have fulfilled their engagements, and requesting to be informed if they may not be allowed to enter into new ones. July 1; No. 46. Answered, July 16, informing that the Board authorize him to enter into new engagements with the above proprietors, and to bring the deposits to credit as part of the public revenue.

2944. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, reporting his having attached Parganá Baliá, and the land of Rájá of Bardwán in Bishnupur. June 28; No. 2.

2945. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, stating that Mánik Rám Chakrabartti is not possessed of any further property that could be disposed of for discharge of his dues to Government. May 17; No. 55. Answered, July 2, directing him to take the necessary measures to ascertain if the above person has any property in any other District, and that the Board do not deem it expedient to release him.

2946. Letter from Collector of Purniah, regarding depredations committed by religious mendicants (Fakírs) to the northward of Súrjyapur. July 3; No. 41.

2947. Letter to Acting President, requesting him to write a Parwaná to Rájá Rámkrishna, recommending him immediately to hold his Punyá, and in the event of his neglecting to pay his dues to Government, to inform him that his lands will inevitably be sold. July 16.

2948. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, regarding arrears due from the separated Tálukdárs. June 5; No. 30.

2949. Letter to Commissioner of Rájsháhí, directing him to submit a statement of the Rájá's lands to be sold in discharge of the customary fee on account of his getting the deed for his estate (Sanad fee). July 5.

2950. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, regarding Rájá Bikramárjit Sinh's requiring a loan of money from Mr. Murray. June 22; No. 15. Answered, July 2, No. 17, stating that all loans by

Europeans to landholders are contrary to the Regulations, and that the Rájá's request to mortgage his Zamíndárí to Mr. Murray is inadmissible.

2951. Standing order regarding lands obtained by alluvion; Government to leave the right of levying an increase on lands so obtained, to be determined by the circumstances of the cases which may occur, and the law and wages of the country. July 2.

2952. Letter from Collector of Silhet, reporting heavy rains, stating his fears that it will hurt the crops, and requesting to know whether in any extremity he is allowed to open the deposits of grain. June 28; No. 6. Answered, July 9, No. 7, stating that the Board do not think it expedient to recommend his being authorized to open any of the stores (Golás).

2953. Letter from Collector of Silhet, reporting on the high price of grain in his District owing to inundation. July 6; No. 5.

2954. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, regarding Settlement of his District. April 16; No. 10.

2955. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, submitting his opinion to claims for reduction on account of losses sustained by inundation. June 29; No. 37a. Answered, July 12, No. 38, approving of his measures.

2956. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, submitting a corrected statement of lands of proprietors sufficient to liquidate their arrears of revenue. July 8; No. 11.

2957. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, presenting petitions from the Názír Indra Náráin Ghosh and Debí Charan Rái relative to balances due from the salt manufacturers (Malangís). July 16; No. 52.

2958. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, directing him to inform the landholders, that in the event of the salt manufacturers (Malangís) neglecting to discharge the arrears due, he will proceed against them agreeably to the Regulations. July 16.

2959. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, transmitting extract of a letter from Council, directing him to proceed to the sale of lands of sundry proprietors, after advertising them; and in the event of any alteration necessary in the assessment, to state to the Board the grounds of such alteration. July 19.

2960. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, submitting a list of Mahals placed under the charge of the Sazáwals. June 10; No. 13.

2961. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, requesting information regarding Decennial Settlement of his District. June 19; No. 14.

whether, in the partition (Batwára) made by the late Collector of Mahmúdsháhí, the several villages were divided between the respective sharers, and to state in what instances they have departed from it. July 16.

2973. Letter to Collector of Jessor, relative to the Settlement with separated Tálukdárs of Bhitariá and Bhúshná. July 26.

2974. Letter from Collector of Jessor, regarding permanently held (Mukarrarí) Táluks included in the gross amount of revenue payable by the subordinate cultivator to the Zamíndárs of Parganás separated from Rájsháhí. July 20; No. 12.

2975. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, relative to the Settlement of Government estates (khás Mahals) delivered over by the Collector of Murshidábád, and submitting a statement of their proposed Sadr assessment. June 18; No. 24.

2976. Letter to Commissioner of Rájsháhí, informing him of the amount realized from the several sales of lands of the Rájá, and directing him to submit a statement of the balance still remaining due. July 23.

2977. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, submitting an account Settlement for the current and ensuing years of the separated Tálukdárs of Bhitariá and Bhúshná. April 30; No. 6. Answered, July 26, No. 10, approving of his having taken engagements from them.

2978. Letter from Collector of Behar, forwarding written relinquishments of the Zamíndárs at Ghyáspur. April 29; No. 19.

2979. Letter from Collector of Behar, forwarding an account current between Rájá Naráyan Sinh and the Government. April 30; No. 3.

2980. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, submitting a statement of lands for sale, the property of Rájás Chaitan Sinh and Dámodar Sinh, situated in Bishnupur. July 8; No. 28.

2981. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, informing him of the balance due from the Rájá of Bardwán being paid into the Treasury, and directing him to state what further balance remains due on account of the year 1199. July 23.

2982. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, regarding separations and annexations. June 25; No. 34.

2983. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, relative to lands farmed by the French. July 24; No. 19. Answered, July 30; No. 20.

relative to the 43d and 44th Articles of the amended code of Regulations having been superseded. August 16.

2998. Circular Letter to Collectors, directing them not to interfere with the Zamíndárs in holding the Punyá. August 16.

2999. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, submitting a statement of the alterations necessary to be made in the account Settlement of his District. July 23; No. 43. Answered, August 2, approving of the above Settlement.

3000. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, informing him that Government agrees to Board's propositions respecting the resumed rent-free (Lákhiráj) lands, the proprietors of which have refused to engage for the rent (Jamá) required. August 6.

3001. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, enclosing a letter from Collector of Murshidábád, relative to the annexations and separations of sundry Mahals from Murshidábád to his District. August 16.

3002. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, relative to separation of Mahals from Bhágalpur, and their annexation to his District. June 8.

3003. Letter from Collector of Dacca, reporting on a petition of Kálí Prasád Pál. January 29; No. 11.

3004. Letter to Collector of Dacca, stating that the Board trust the arrears of Takáví will soon be realized. August 2.

3005. Letter from Collector of Dacca, relative to annexation of Sharífpur to his District. July 19; No. 15.

3006. Letter from Collector of Dacca, submitting statement of Mahals separated from Murshidábád, and annexed to his District. May 29; No. 16.

3007. Letter to Governor-General in Council, relative to the management of the Rájá of Rájsháhí's lands, in consequence of his refusing to hold the Punyá. August 2; No. 9.

3008. Letter to Governor-General in Council, relative to claims to the resumption of rent-free lands being decided by the Collectors. August 2; No. 26.

3009. Letter to Governor-General in Council, relative to Takáví advances due from the Rájá of Rájsháhí. August 2; No. 28.

3010. Letter to Governor-General in Council, relative to the sale of lands in Panchánnagáon. August 2; No. 34.

3011. Letter from Governor-General in Council, stating that the Regulation empowering the landholders to distrain for balances is to be vested in the Judges; sanctioning the release of Mánik Rám Chakrabartti; approving sale of rent-free villages of Rámnaráin

Koá; agreeing to proposition respecting resumed rent-free (Lákhiráj) lands in Dinájpur. August 2; No. 3.

3012. Letter to Governor-General in Council, requesting orders regarding the Settlement of Baramanirámpur. August 9; No. 50.

3013. Letter from Governor-General in Council, relative to establishing Gold Mohars in currency at Sikka Rs. 16 without deduction. August 12; No. 4.

3014. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that orders respecting the Sadr Kánúngos be applied to Behar; to acquaint the Rájá of Rájsháhí that his lands will be sold whether he holds his Punyá or not; Collectors not to interfere with Zamíndárs in holding the Punyá; by the new Regulations, prosecutions for the recovery of dues from alienated lands held under invalid titles are to be instituted in Courts of Justice. August 9; No. 21.

3015. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing sale of lands of the proprietors of Bishnupur. August 23; No. 1.

3016. Letter to Governor-General in Council, relative to the sale of lands of Rájá Tej Chánd in the 24 Parganás. August 30; No. 7.

3017. Letter from Agent at Hijili, submitting a statement of lands, with the collection and balance statement (Jamá Wásil Bákí) of the proprietors in balance in Jaleswar. August 4; No. 25.

3018. Letter from Collector of Jessor, reporting on the petition of Mír Atáullá. April 21; No. 25. Answered, August 2, stating that the lands ought not to have been attached, and ordering him to release them.

3019. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, reporting measures taken in consequence of the Rájá of Rájsháhí having refused to hold his Punyá. July 29; No. 6. Answered, August 2; No. 8.

3020. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, directing him to submit a statement of unclaimed khas Táluks, specifying the rent (Jamá) thereof. August 6.

3021. Letter to Collector of Maimansinh, regarding the annexation of sundry Mahals to Tipperah. August 16.

3022. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, transmitting copy of a letter from the Commissioner of Rájsháhí, relative to the Collector of Rájsháhí being authorized to confine the Rájá, on account of balances due in his District. August 20.

3023. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, directing him to take off the attachment of Parganá Baliá. August 2.

3024. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, directing the release of Mánik-rám Chakrabartti. August 6.

3025. Letter to Acting President, directing him to issue an order to Rájá Rámkrishna, relative to his refusing to hold his Punyá. August 2.

3026. Letters from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, submitting a question relative to confinement of the Rájá. July 23; No. 16.

3027. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, reporting that the Rájá has signified his intention of holding the Punyá. July 29; No. 17. Answered, August 2; No. 18.

3028. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, reporting that the Rájá has completely discharged his balance on account of 1199. August 6.

3029. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, enclosing the petition of the Zamíndárs of Idrakpur, requesting that Rájkrishna Rái be reinstated. July 27; No. 19. Answered, August 6, authorizing compliance with the petition.

3030. Letter from Collector of Rámgarh, regarding measures recommended to be adopted for the recovery of balance due from the Rájá of Nágpur. August 3; No. 14.

3031. Standing orders, that all lands are to stand in the names of the proprietors for the time being, and that the names of the Mahals are not to be altered. Where independent Táluks or Mahals are called after the present or former proprietors, such names are to be considered as the names of the Mahals, and are not to be changed in future. August 6.

3032. Standing order, that Gold Mohars of full weight, coined since the year 69, shall be considered a legal tender of payment throughout the country, at the rate of 16 Sikká rupees. August 13.

3033. Standing order, that the 43d and 44th articles of the amended code of Regulations are to be superseded by the Proclamation, fixing the public revenue assessed on lands. August 16.

3034. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, relative to separations and annexations. June 30; No. 1.

3035. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, informing him that Government has dismissed him from his collectorship. August 9.

3036. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, regarding separations and annexations. May 9; No. 2.

3037. Letter from Agent at Tamluk, submittting proposed Settlement of his District. April 26; No. 7. Answered, August 20; No. 8.

3038. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, enclosing statement of lands advertised to be sold in liquidation of balances. August 10; No. 21.

3039. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, informing of his having confined the Rájá on account of his balance due to Government, and of his having received a letter from the Collector of Murshidábád, to enforce a writ (Dastak) on him for arrears due in his District. August 9; No. 23.

3040. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhi, reporting that the Rájá has held his Punyá. August 12; No. 67.

3041. Letter from Collector of Jessor, reporting result of his inquiries on the subject of the petition of Anand Chrandra Deb Rái, relative to a Deed of Gift executed by him. July 20; No. 30.

3042. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, with instructions relative to balance due from the Zamíndár of Rájsháhí. August 20; No. 63.

3043. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, submitting a statement of the lands of Rájá Tej Chánd, recommended for sale. August 15; No. 5.

3044. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh, submitting a statement of balances of landholders who have not made good their engagements. July 31; No. 42. Answered, August 27; No. 43.

3045. Letter from Collector of Jessor, regarding separations and annexations. June 7; No. 18. Answered, August 23, directing him to submit a statement of the rent of the several Mahals required to be separated from Jessor and annexed to Bardwán.

3046. Letter from Commissioner of Rájsháhí, relative to separations and annexations. May 23; No. 11. Answered, May 17 and 31; Nos. 19 and 21.

3047. Letter from Collector of Behar, relative to steps taken to realize balances. August 8; Nos. 8 and 10. Answered, August 27; No. 13.

## SEPTEMBER, 1793.

3048. Letter from Commissioner of Behar, reporting on the Decennial Settlement of Tirhut. August 21; No. 47.

3049. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, recommending the confinement of Báránasi Ghosh on account of arrears due to Government. August 28; No. 27. Answered, September 3; No. 28.

3050. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, reporting that Sibnáráyan

Mustafí having paid the two first instalments of his bond, he has released the Zamíndár of Chitwá. August 19; No. 36. Answered, September 6.

3051. Letter from Collector of Bardwán, requesting instructions in consequence of his having attached the property of the security of the Farmer of Mansúrpur. September 14; No. 53. Answered, September 17; No. 55.

3052. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, stating that he has given charge to the proprietors whose lands were sequestrated, in consequence of their arrears having been paid up. August 25; No. 41.

3053. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, regarding the investigation of the rent-free (Lakhiráj) tenures in Sandwíp. July 6; No. 11. Answered, September 13; No. 12.

3054. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, assigning reasons for landholders having omitted to hold their Punyá. September 10; No. 57.

3055. Minute by Mr. Charles Chapman, relative to the Zamíndárí of Dinájpur. September 24; No. 50.

3056. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, stating that the annexations and separations of the several Mahals proposed by him have been approved by Council, and directing him to deliver them over to the Collectors of Rangpur and Rájsháhí. September 3.

3057. Letter from Collector of Dacca, regarding recovery of Takávi balances. August 14; No. 22.

3058. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving an Establishment for the immediate Government (khás) management of Kánkjol. August 30; No. 1.

3059. Letter to Collector of Dacca, stating that the Council disapproves of the attachment of the revenue of the Chandrá Mahals. September 3.

3060. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing to Board's proposition relative to Baramanirámpur, and also to the suspension of arrears due from the Tálukdárs of Sabinará. August 30; No. 4.

3061. Letter to Governor-General in Council, recommending a reduction in the establishment of the Kárkún office (Daftar). September 3; No. 19.

3062. Letter from Governor-General in Council, agreeing to propositions respecting Landholders in Tirhut whose estates have been en-

croached upon by the river; and authorizing proposed reductions in the Kárkún office (Daftar). September 6; No. 1.

3063. Letter to Governor-General in Council, relative to an application made by the Zamíndár of Yusafpur, regarding rents for lands for the manufacture of Salt (Khálárí). September 20; No. 28.

3064. Letter to Governor-General in Council, requesting to be informed in what mode the Sázáwals are to be proceeded against who have been guilty of embezzlement. September 27; No. 15.

3065. Letter to Agent at Hijili, informing him that the Council defer coming to any determination relative to the proposed stipulation with the Zamíndárs, and directing the sale of lands in Jaleswar. September 3.

3066. Letter to Agent at Hijili, with instructions relative to the Settlement of his District. September 10; No. 7.

3067. Letter from Agent at Hijili, relative to the Settlement with the Zamíndárs of Jaleswar. September 3; No. 18. Answered, September 10, No. 9, conveying him instructions on the above.

3068. Letter to Collector of Jessor, informing him of the annexation of Basurhát to his District, and of its separation from Nadiyá. September 3.

3069. Letter to Collector of Jessor, transmitting him orders from Council, relative to division of 12-16th share (three-fourths) of Mahmúdsháhí. September 3.

3070. Letter from Collector of Jessor, submitting statement of lands proposed to be sold in liquidation of arrears due from sundry separated Tálukdárs in Bhúshná. August 23; No. 9. Answered, September 3, directing him to sell the above lands.

3071. Letter from Collector of Jessor, reporting on the Jamá of the Khás Táluks. August 21; No. 29.

3072. Letter from Collector of Jessor, transmitting a statement of the rent (Jamá) and Sadr assessment proposed for the Khás Táluks annexed to his District. August 22; No. 18.

3073. Letter from Collector of Jessor, reporting having deputed a Sazáwal to make the collections of Taraf Mágurá, in consequence of the proprietor having fallen in balance. September 10; No. 40.

3074. Letter from Collector of Jessor, regarding the farming of the Táluks of Bhúshná annexed to his District. September 12; No. 47.

3075. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, informing him of the separa-

tion of Mauzá Anwarpur from Nadiyá, and of its annexation to his District. September 3.

3076. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, enclosing Mr. Hesilrige's report regarding the Madrasah Mahal. May 27; No. 5.

3077. Letter from Collector of Purniah, desiring instructions regarding Tánjipur, the late proprietor having requested to be restored to the management. August 26; No. 38. Answered, September 3, informing him he would not be authorized to give possession to the late proprietor of Tánjipur.

3078. Minute by Acting President, relative to a dispute between the Zamíndár of Dinájpur and his Díwán. September 24; Nos. 48 and 51.

3079. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, submitting a statement of lands separated from Dinájpur, to be annexed to his District. September 3.

3080. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, requesting orders relative to a decree passed in the Civil Court (Díwání Adálat) adjudging the property of Táluks Kandarpur, etc., in Kánkniá to Rám Rám Sen. July 6; No. 17. Answered, September 6.

3081. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, recommending that Syám Krishna be released from confinement, on his giving the security stated in his application for the payment of the sums embezzled. September 12; No. 32.

3082. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, reporting the refusal of Krishna Chánd Cháttarji to enter into engagements for farming Kutabpur. September 20; No. 53. Answered, September 24, directing him to advertise for receipt of proposals for farming Kutabpur.

3083. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, enclosing a list of Mahals proposed to be separated from Murshidábád and annexed to other Districts. August 26; No. 7.

3084. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, reporting the recovery of outstanding balances due from the merchants and traders exempt from miscellaneous (Sáyer) duties. August 14; No. 17.

3085. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, reporting on sums paid by Rájá Rámkrishna. August 20; No. 43.

3086. Letter to Collector of Murshidábád, directing him to pay the Rání of Rájsháhí her allowance from his Treasury. September 17.

3087. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, approving abatement to be allowed in Tappá Manirámpur. September 3.

3088. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, submitting a petition from Rájá Iswár Chánd Rái, stating the difficulty experienced by him in the collection of revenues. September 6; No. 35. Answered, September 10, stating that the Board deem the Rájá's petition inadmissible.

3089. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, submitting a petition from the Tálukdárs of Bhátpárá, relative to their lands having been attached. September 2; No. 43.

3090. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, relative to the Settlement of sundry Mahals. August 22; No. 30. Answered, September 13; No. 35.

3091. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, relative to lands farmed by the French. September 11; No. 32.

3092. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí, authorizing the annexation of several Mahals to his District, separated from Dinájpur. September 3.

3093. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, regarding Government (khás) Táluks separated from Murshidábád, and requesting sanction for abatements to be allowed in them. August 24; No. 4.

3094. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, relative to the recovery of balances of Takáví. August 26; No. 40. Answered, September 10, informing him that the Board approve the period proposed by him for payment of Takáví due from the Rájá.

3095. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, stating reasons given by landholders for having omitted to hold their Punyá. August 26; No. 41.

3096. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, reporting having issued an advertisement, calling for proposals for farming sundry Táluks, the proprietors of which are absent. August 26; No. 42.

3097. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, relative to applications for division of undivided Táluks. September 6; No. 5. Answered, September 10, transmitting instructions thereon.

3098. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí, transmitting Board's letter to Council, with extract of a letter from the Governor-General, authorizing the Zamíndár to be allowed one month for producing proofs of the disbursements mentioned in his statement; approving the allowance to the Rání being paid from Murshidábád Treasury; and also approving of proposed abatement in the Jamá of the Zamíndárs. September 17.

3099. Letter to Collector of Sarkár Sáran, transmitting orders from

Council, relative to farms held by Jagomohan being immediately annulled. September 3.

100. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, submitting correspondence regarding claims to villages belonging to Srí Krishna Sinh and Abdul Sinh, advertised for sale. August 19; No. 14.

101. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, requesting instructions, in consequence of the landholders having concealed themselves, and evaded the payment of their revenues to Government. August 24; No. 37. Answered, September 3, directing him, on any such cases occurring, to attach the lands of the proprietors.

3102. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, referring certain questions relative to the recovery of arrears of balances, and the mode to be observed in enforcing the payment of them. August 8; No. 26.

3103. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, stating difficulties which he has to contend with in conducting the duties of his station. August 12; No. 26a. Answered, September 5, stating that he must be guided by the Regulations.

3104. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, reporting on damages sustained in villages by encroachments of the Ganges. September 3; No. 42.

3105. Letter from Agent at Tamluk, reporting that he has discharged the revenue establishments, in consequence of the collections having been ordered to be annexed to the Midnapur District. September 19; No. 44.

3106. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, reporting on balances paid by Tilakrám Pákrásí, Tálukdár of Parganá Azímábád, and of his having recalled the Sazáwal. September 2; No. 34.

3107. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, submitting a statement of subsistence (Nánkár) allowances claimed by sundry landholders. August 29; No. 3.

3108. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, regarding the confinement of the Rájá on account of balances due in Nadiyá. September 12; No. 49. Answered, September 17, directing him to confine the Rájá until the Collector of Nadiyá shall have received the balance due.

3109. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, reporting that the Rájá has paid up his arrears on account of lands in Nadiyá. September 14; No. 44.

3110. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, regarding Takáví balances due from the Rájá. September 16; No. 13.

3111. Letter to Collector of Rájsháhí, directing him, in the event of the Zamíndár not paying the second instalment on account of Takáví balances, to stop it out of his remittances of revenue. September 27.

3112. Letter from Collector of Jessor, reporting that he has deputed a Sazáwal to make collections of Takáví, in consequence of the proprietors having fallen into balances. September 12; No. 5.

3113. Letter from Collector of Jessor, regarding balances due from Rájá Sríkánt Rái, on account of which his lands had been placed under sequestration. July 30; No. 26.

3114. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, regarding balances due from the Zamíndár of Idrakpur. September 21; No. 36. Answered, September 27, authorizing sale of lands in Idrakpur.

## OCTOBER, 1793.

3115. Petition from Rájá Rádhánáth, requesting to be established in his hereditary Zamíndárí in Dinájpur. October 8; No. 36.

3116. Letter to Collector of Behar, transmitting orders from Council relative to arrears due from Manír Baliá, Manaurá and Máldah; also authorizing abatements in Salímábád, and of the sale of lands belonging to Fathi Sinh and another. October 4.

3117. Letter to Collector of Behar, transmitting copy of the Regulations for raising an annual fund for defraying the expense of the Police establishments. October 18.

3118. Letter from Collector of Behar, submitting a statement of arrears due in Parganás Charkhán and Azímábád, and recommending sale of lands in liquidation. October 20; No. 30.

3119. Letter from Collector of Behar, enclosing petition from Jhoda Rám Kánúngo, regarding mismanagement of the Dewang (qy.). October 18; No. 37. Answered, October 29, transmitting instructions relative to the above.

3120. Letter from Commissioner of Behar, reporting result of his inquiries in Sarkár Sáran. October 4; No. 20.

3121. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, submitting a petition from Rájá Muhammad Zamán Khán relative to balance of revenue. October 17; No. 11. Answered, October 29; No. 13.

3122. Minutes by Mr. John Buller, respecting the future management of Mandalghát in the Bardwán District. October 25; No. 52 and No. 54.

3123. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, directing him to sell the lands in Bishnupur advertised for sale, without delay. October 1.

3124. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, approving of the Jamá to be assessed on the lands of Prem Chánd. October 8.

3125. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, informing of the annexation to his District of Jagdíspur from Bírbhúm, and of Baroá from Dinájpur (?). October 8.

3126. Letter from Collector of Calcutta, recommending the formation of a new Jamábandí for Panchánnagáon. October 23; No. 13. Answered, October 25, transmitting instructions relative to the above.

3127. Circular Letter to Collectors, directing them to prosecute in the Civil Court (Díwání Adálat) Sazáwals found guilty of embezzlement. October 1.

3128. Circular Letter to Collectors, informing them of the resignation of Marquis Cornwallis. October 29.

3129. Letter from Collector of Dacca, relative to the annexation of Durgápur and other Mahals to Tipperah. September 12; No. 26.

3130. Letter from Collector of Dacca, relative to the annexation and separation of sundry Mahals. September 14; No. 33.

3131. Letter to Collector of Dacca, stating that Mauzá Lakshmíbárí, separated from Tipperah, has been annexed to his District. October 8.

3132. Letter to Collector of Dacca, informing him of the separation of several Mahals from his District, and of their annexation to Tipperah. October 18.

3133. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that the first 15 paragraphs of the Collector of Dinájpur's letter be translated and transmitted to him, with directions to call on the Rájá for his answer thereto; also to prohibit him from altering the Sadr or Mufással arrangements. September 27; No. 1.

3134. Letter from Governor-General in Council, relative to report of Mr. Vanderheyden on the Settlement of Tirhut. October 1; No. 8.

3135. Letter to Governor-General in Council, relative to a charge preferred by the Zamíndár of Dinájpur against his Díwán and Manik Cháng. October 18; No. 3.

3136. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting Accountant's report on receipts and balances of Land Revenue in the Bengal Districts. October 22; No. 8.

3150. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, directing him to proceed against the Zamíndárs in the event of their not attending to pay their revenues. October 4.

3151. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, submitting a Jámá Wásil Bákí of the Madrasá Mahal, and recommending the sale of the lands. September 23; No. 12. Answered, October 4, stating the Board does not deem it expedient immediately to sell the lands.

3152. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, transmitting orders from Council respecting sale of Bhuluá, with instructions relative to the collection of Suspensions. October 18.

3153. Minute by Acting President, relative to the future management of Mandalghát in Bardwán. October 25; Nos. 53 and 54a.

3154. Letter to Collector of Rangpur, stating that the Collector of Dinájpur has been instructed to deliver over Islámábád to be annexed to his District. October 8.

3155. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, relative to Council's orders for the abolition of the 43d and 44th Article of the Code of Regulations. September 30; No. 39. Answered, October 18; No. 42.

3156. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, submitting a statement of lands of Parganá Idrakpur proposed to be sold on account of arrears to Government. October 15; No. 14.

3157. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, relative to the separation of Mahals from his District to be annexed to Bírbhúm. August 22; No. 5.

3158. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, relative to the annexation of Mahals to Bardwán. August 22; No. 7.

3159. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, submitting a petition from the Rájá relative to his arrears of Takáví. October 4; No. 32. Answered, August 11, stating that the prayer of the Rájá's petition is inadmissible.

3160. Letter to Collector of Sarkár Sáran, transmitting orders for sale of lands of Basant Saháí, in satisfaction of a decree passed against him. October 18.

3161. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, submitting statement of lands for sale, the property of Rájá Srikrishna Sinh and Abdul Sinh, on account of arrears due to Government. October 12; No. 17.

3162. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, relative to annexations and separations of several Mahals. July 28; No. 15.

3163. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, submitting statement of

proposed Establishment for the immediate Government (khás) management of Bhuluá and Amrábád. October 7; No. 11.

3164. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, transmitting Settlement concluded with the Zamíndárs of Dandrá and Alláhábád. September 28; No. 34. Answered, October 22; No. 40.

3165. Letter to Collector of Tirhut, transmitting orders from Council on Mr. Vanderheyden's report on the Settlement of his District. October 8.

3166. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, regarding Tálukdárs of separated Táluks who have engaged. September 26; No. 27.

3167. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, relative to claims of the Tálukdárs to separation. October 4; No. 28. Answered, October 25, approving of his propositions.

3168. Letter to Collector of Bardwán, relative to the future management of Mandalghát. October 25; No. 55.

3169. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, stating that he has communicated the orders of Council to the Rájá relative to his lands. October 7; No. 14.

3170. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, submitting a petition from his Díwán. October 22; No. 23.

3171. Letter to Collector of Jessor, authorizing Tahsíldárí establishment for the Government (khás) Táluks annexed to his District. October 22.

3172. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, submitting a proposition from Rájá Barkisor Sinh, respecting Tappá Dáhu Sáhu, lately adjudged as subsistence land (Nánkár) to Bábu Abdul Sinh. September 26; No. 19. Answered, October 29; No. 21.

## NOVEMBER, 1793.

3173. Letter from Collector of Behar, submitting an account of the gross collections of the resumed Jágír of Nawáb Muhammad Rezá Khán. October 20; No. 33.

3174. Letter from Collector of Behar, stating that he has instituted a prosecution for the recovery of balances against the proprietor of Narhat. October 23; No. 43. Answered, November 1, informing him that Board approve of measures adopted.

3175. Letter from Collector of Behar, submitting a list of effects of

Krishna Náráyan and Mánik Rái, in confinement on account of balances, and requesting instructions. October 23; No. 33.

3176. Letter from Collector of Behar, enclosing copies of two petitions from Kur Rám Náráyan, whom he had released from confinement on his giving security for the payment of his arrears to Government. October 24; No. 25.

3177. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, submitting a statement of lands for sale, on account of balances due from the Rájá. November 16; No. 1.

3178. Letter to Collector of Bírbhúm, directing him to report if he has allotted rent (Jámá) on the lands conformably to the late Proclamation. November 19.

3179. Letter from Commissioner of Behar, reporting on the state of the Decennial Settlement of Sháhábád. October 7; No. 50.

3180. Letter from Commissioner of Behar, reporting having completed his inquiries into the state of the Decennial Settlement in Behar proper. November 4; No. 9.

3181. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, submitting proposed assessment of resumed rent-free (Lákhiráj) lands. October 22; No. 20. Answered, November 5, approving of assessments.

3182. Letter from Collector of Chittagong, stating that he has received the form for the distribution of the assessment to be observed by the Zamíndárs and Tálukdárs. August 11; No. 46.

3183. Letter to Collector of Calcutta, authorizing proposed new measurement and assessment (Jamábandí) of Panchánnagáon. November 26.

3184. Circular Letter to Collectors, informing them of orders of Council, that no European shall be allowed to rent or hold more than fifty bighás of land. November 26.

3185. Minute by Mr. Charles Chapman, relative to the conduct of the Zamíndár of Dinájpur. November 8; Nos. 28 and 29.

3186. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur reporting that the Rájá has evaded compliance with the orders of Government. October 29; No. 24.

3187. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, reporting on a petition from Rájá Radhánáth. October 22; No. 13.

3188. Letter to Collector of Dacca, authorizing the separation of sundry Mahals from his District, and their annexation to Tipperah. November 15.

3189. Letter from Governor-General in Council, directing that an allow-

ance be granted to the Barkandázes to keep the road clear of tigers. October 18; No. 1.

3190. Letter to Governor-General in Council, relative to outstandings in the Nadiyá District. November 1; No. 11.

3191. Letter to Governor-General in Council, regarding the conduct of the Zamíndár of Dinájpur. November 8; No. 32.

3192. Letter to Governor-General in Council, stating that the Board have issued the necessary orders relative to the departure of the Vizier of Oudh's ministers from Calcutta. November 12; No. 2.

3193. Letter from Governor-General in Council, approving of instructions given for recovery of arrears due from the Rájá of Nadiyá. November 8; No. 3.

3194. Letter from Governor-General in Council, relative to the settlement of the Jágír of the late Nawáb Muhammad Rezá Khán; also regarding complaints made by the Collector of Dinájpur against the Rájá. November 22; No. 8.

3195. Letter from Agent at Hijili, relative to the Nimakí Páikán (Salt Jágír) lands. October 25; No. 2.

3196. Letter from Agent at Hijili, submitting particulars of the Tashkis Kimminil (?) in Jaleswar. November 6.

3197. Letter from Agent at Hijili, submitting an application from the Zamíndárs to make collections in their respective Districts until the Settlement is concluded. October 27; No. 23.

3198. Letter from Collector of Jessor, submitting a statement of lands of Mardlál Sen, situated in Chaklá Bhúshná. October 9; No. 40. Answered, November 12, authorizing him to sell the lands in question to discharge balance due on account of last year.

3199. Letter from Collector of Jessor, regarding outstanding balances, and submitting statement of land proposed to be sold. November 16; No. 37. Answered, November 22; No. 40.

3200. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, submitting statement of lands of Rám Náráyan Mallik proposed for sale. October 31; No. 3.

3201. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, regarding Managers for disqualified landholders being allowed to grant leases (Pattás). November 5; No. 1. Answered, November 15; No. 2.

3202. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, transmitting orders from Council for sale of lands of the Zamíndár of Kásijorá, and the Chaudhrís and Tálukdárs of Bhuiyámutá. November 15.

3203. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, transmitting orders from Council relative to the Makná Thána Lands. November 1.

3204. Minute by Acting President, regarding the conduct of the Zamíndár of Dinájpur. November 8; No. 30.

3205. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, reporting the sale of Musá Pawálá Ghát. November 9; No. 3. Answered, November 19; No. 5.

3206. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, relative to the recovery of balances. October 25; No. 17.

3207. Letter from Collector of Rájsháhí, reporting on the petition of the Farmer of Rokanpur, requesting the transfer of Sarsábád from Purniah to Rájsháhí. November 16; No. 19.

3208. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, submitting a statement of the collections of Government (Khás) villages in Parganá Arrah. October 24; No. 9.

3209. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, submitting a statement of balances outstanding on account of the year 1200. October 12; No. 18. Answered, November 8; No. 23.

3210. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, representing the misconduct of the Kánúngo of Parganá Goá. October 29; No. 10.

3211. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, regarding steps taken against the former Sazáwal of Bhuluá, on account of his embezzlement of the collections. October 28; No. 17.

3212. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, authorizing the separation of sundry Mahals from Dacca to be annexed to his District. November 15.

3213. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, regarding monthly allowance (Musháhará) payable to the minor proprietor of Phitkárá. October 19; No. 17. Answered, November 15, transmitting instructions relative to the above.

3214. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, relative to the settlement of the late Nawáb Muzaffar Jang's Jágir. November 2; No. 4.

3215. Letter from Agent at Tamluk, relative to Establishment and Settlement proposed for the year 1200. November 19; No. 15.

3216. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, requesting instructions regarding disputes on boundaries of lands after they are sold. November 13; No. 10. Answered, November 19, informing him that all such disputes are cognizable in the Civil Court (Díwání Adálát).

3217. Letter to Collector of Midnapur, directing him to sell the lands of Rámnáráyan. November 25.

3218. Letter to Collector of Tipperah, directing him to sell the lands in Maihát. November 26.

3219. Letter to Collector of Behar, transmitting orders from Council for the property of Manu Rái and Krishnarám to be restored to them. November 26.

3220. Letter to Collector of Behar, stating that Council approve of the release of Kur Rámnáráyan. November 26.

3221. Letter from Collector of Silhet, reporting on the corrected Settlement of his District. October 26; No. 9.

3222. Letter from Collector of Silhet, on increases in the Settlement; also regarding sale of lands for balances. (Date omitted.)

3223. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, regarding balances due from Rájá Rám Pálit. November 21; No. 2.

3224. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, regarding allotment of the rent payable to Government (Sadr Jamá) on lands proposed to be sold. November 21; No. 2a.

3225. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, recommending sale of lands in liquidation of balance due from Rájá Tej Chánd on account of Suspensions. October 29, No. 13, and November 20, No. 14. Answered, November 26; No. 15.

3226. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, regarding annexations to his District. April 20; No. 14. Answered, November 29.

3227. Letter to Collector of Nadiyá, transmitting statement of Mahals said to be under Mandalghát, and proposed to be separated; with directions to report what objections there are to their being annexed to Bardwán. November 29.

## DECEMBER, 1793.

3228. Petition from Rádhámohan and several Tálukdárs in Jessor, proprietors of Sautoradpur in Manhátí, praying to have their lands released. December 20; No. 41.

3229. Letter to Collector of Behar, transmitting copy of a letter from Sub-Secretary, relative to a disputed right of jurisdiction between him and the Collector of Rámgarh of several villages, and directing him to deliver them over to Rámgarh, and to consider them annexed to that District. December 31.

3230. Letter from Collector of Bírbhúm, stating that the rent (Jamá) has been allotted on the lands proposed to be sold in his letter of the 15th November. November 30; No. 20.

clamorous. December 10; No. 9. Answered, December 17; No. 10.

3245. Letter from Collector of Dinájpur, regarding the annexation and separation of sundry Mahals. November 14; No. 38.

3246. Letter to Collector of Dinájpur, directing him to submit a statement of the rent (Jamá) which ought to be allotted on the Mahals proposed to be annexed to Rájsháhí. December 17.

3247. Letter from Collector of Dacca, relative to the separation of several Mahals proposed to be annexed to Maimansinh. November 20; No. 25.

3248. Letter to Collector of Dacca, authorizing separation of Tappá Kálná from his District, and its annexation to Maimansinh. December 24.

3249. Letter to Collector of Dacca, informing him of orders of Government for the separation of Shaikh Kali, and of its annexation to Tipperah. December 24.

3250. Letter to Governor-General in Council, requesting to be authorized to instruct the Collector of Midnapur to allow the Zamíndár his monthly allowance (Musháhará). December 13; No. 7.

3251. Letter to Governor-General in Council, transmitting proceedings regarding a claim to monthly allowance (Musháhará) on the part of the Zamíndárs of Phitkárá. December 13; No. 17.

3252. Letter to Governor-General in Council, recommending that the surplus in the Treasury belonging to the Rájá of Rájsháhí be carried to his credit on account of the fee due from him for the deed of grant (Sanad). December 13; No. 28.

3253. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting proceedings relative to the allowances for the maintenance of the religious establishment of the Zamíndárs in Silhet. December 20; No. 35.

3254. Letter to Governor-General in Council, regarding transfer of lands, with the Board's recommendation that it be placed under certain restrictions. December 24; No. 7.

3255. Letter to Governor-General in Council, regarding sundry revenue charges in Silhet. December 24; No. 19.

3256. Letter to Governor-General in Council, submitting two letters from the late Collector of Silhet, in reply to a petition presented against him at the Chief Revenue Court (Khálsá) by persons calling themselves Kánúngos, Zamíndárs, and Chaudhrís of Silhet. December 24; No. 32.

Tálukdári Mahals. November 28; No. 6. Answered, December 13; No. 8.

3267. Letter from Collector of Midnapur, submitting a statement of lands recommended to be sold in discharge of two decrees passed against the Rájá of Kásijorá, and the Chaudhrís and Tálukdárs of Bhuiyámutá. December 6; No. 12. Answered, December 13, authorizing him to sell such portions of the lands as may be necessary to discharge the amount.

3268. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, relative to annexation and separation of sundry Mahals. September 3; No. 34.

3269. Letter from Collector of Murshidábád, submitting a statement of lands dependent on the Government (khás) Táluks, etc., with a report on those he would recommend to be given as a Jágír to Hamíd Khán. December 14; No. 28.

3270. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, relative to the claims of Krishna Behári Chaudhrí to part of the Zamíndárí of Palásbárí. November 25; No. 22. Answered, December 17, approving of the measures adopted by him, with directions to allot the rent (Jamá) anew.

3271. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, submitting a petition from Rám Kánt Chaudhri, Zamíndár of one-fourth or 4 annas Chaklá Karjihát, at present in Jail, praying that he may be removed to his own house in consequence of indisposition. December 17; No. 8.

3272. Letter from Collector of Rangpur, reporting that the Zamíndár of Chaklá Karjihát having paid up his balance of revenue, he had released him from Jail. December 19; No. 8a.

3273. Letter to Collector of Rámgarh, transmitting orders of Council relative to disputed jurisdiction of certain villages between him and the Judge of Behar; directing him to consider them as annexed to his District, and informing him that the Collector of Behar has been instructed to deliver them over accordingly. December 31.

3274. Letter from Collector of Maimansinh, relative to annexation and separation of sundry Mahals. November 3; No. 33a.

3275. Letter to Collector of Maimansinh, transmitting orders for the separation of Rángátumal, and of its annexation to Dacca. December 24.

3276. Letter from Collector of Nadiyá, reporting that the Zamíndár has paid up his full balance. November 30; No. 40.

3277. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, informing him that the Council has authorized the sale of the lands of Rájá Rám Pálit, and directing him to make the sale accordingly. December 3.

3278. Letter to Collector of 24 Parganás, directing him to report on the subject of Rádhikácharan Manohar's claim to parts of the Madrasah lands. December 6.

3279. Letter from Collector of 24 Parganás, stating the measures proposed by him for recovery of balances of suspensions due from Rájá Tej Chánd, and reporting that Parganá Háthiágarh is his property. December 6, No. 21. Answered, December 9.

3280. Letter to Collector of Purniah, transmitting orders for the separation of Kolárá and other estates situated to the eastward of Nagan and Mahánandá rivers, and of their annexation to Dinájpur. December 24.

3281. Letter to Collector of Sháhábád, stating that Council approves of the Board's proposition relative to balances due from Kalindar Sinh. December 3.

3282. Letter from Collector of Sháhábád, requesting instructions regarding outstanding balances of Takáví. December 9; No. 16.

3283. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, relative to the conduct of Brajnáth Kánúngo. November 23; No. 3. Answered, December 6; No. 4.

3284. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, regarding claims to Subsistence (Nánkár) Lands. November 14; No. 18.

3285. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, relative to measures adopted for realizing the revenue of Sangrámpur, and also regarding other balances. November 21; No. 20.

3286. Letter to Collector of Sarkár Sáran, directing him to report whether any of the claimants can be considered entitled to a continuance of their Subsistence (Nánkár) allowances. December 9.

3287. Letter from Collector of Sarkár Sáran, submitting account sales of land in Champáran. November 30; No. 26. Answered, December 20, directing him to inform the Board whether the whole of the balances due from those lands had been realized.

3288. Letter from Collector of Silhet, regarding allowances for religious establishment included in the daily allowance holders' (Rozínádárs') accounts. November 30; No. 34.

3289. Letter from Collector of Silhet, submitting in detail the state-

ment by Táluks (Tálukwárí Bandobast) of the Silhet District. November 30; No. 36.

3290. Letter from Collector of Silhet, reporting on a petition presented against himself and the native officers (Mutsaddís) of his District. February 27; No. 28.

3291. Letter from Collector of Silhet, on the above subject, and also complaining against his ministerial officers (Amlá). April 20; No. 29.

3292. Letter from Board of Trade, relative to Salt land (Khálárí) rents in Mandalghát. November 28; No. 18.

3293. Letter from Collector of Tipperah, submitting a statement of the monthly allowance (Musháhára) due to the proprietors of Phitkárá. November 29; No. 15. Answered, December 31, informing him the Council authorizes payment to Zamíndárs of Phitkárá, on account of proprietary allowance (Málikána) for 1198.

3294. Letter to Collector of Tirhut, authorizing an abatement of rent (Jamá) in the settlement of sundry Mahals, and directing him to write off the balances as irrecoverable. December 3.

3295. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, regarding separations from, and annexations to his District. September 27; No. 33.

3296. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, reporting having made over Parganá Kasmár to the Collector of Sáran. November 16; No. 12.

3297. Letter from Collector of Tirhut, regarding the mode of crediting different sorts of rupees received on account of revenues of Government. July 29; No. 37. Answered, December 20, No. 88, directing him to discontinue the practice of deducting from the revenue receipts any estimated proportion on account of deficiency of species of rupees.

3298. Letter from Salt Agent at Tamluk, submitting an Account Settlement of his District. December 23; No. 23.

3299. Letter from Collector of Jessor, reporting his having sold the Government (khás) Táluks that were separated from Murshidábád. December 16; No. 21.

NOTE.—From this year, the date put to the letters and proceedings will be the 'Consultation' date, and not that on which they were originally written.